DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 583 HE 008 354

TITLE	Teaching for Competence in the Delivery of Direct Services.
INSTITUTION	Council on Social Work Education, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	124p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Council on Social Work Education, 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017 ($3.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Caseworker Approach; Clinical Experience; Clinical Professors; Curriculum Design; *Delivery Systems; *Higher Education; Interpersonal Competence; *Intervention; *Performance Based Education; Practicums; *Social Work; *Teaching Quality

ABSTRACT

Enhancing practitioner competence in the delivery of direct services continues to be a prime concern of social work practitioners and educators alike. This document contains 11 articles that pertain to teaching direct intervention theories and skills. Joseph D. Anderson writes on games social work educators' play in teaching practice theories; Robert T. Constable writes on field experience and course work on the undergraduate level as preparation for practice; Charles Garvin writes on education for generalist practice; Carel Germain writes on teaching an ecological perspective for social work practice. Louise C. Johnson deals with social work practice models; John Korbelik and Laura Epstein deal with evaluating time and achievement in a practicum; Henry W. Maier deals with human functioning as an interpersonal whole. Nazneen S. Mayadas and Donald E. O'Brien author two articles: methods and techniques of teaching casework skills and a review of the literature on technology and social casework. Arthur Schwartz writes on the place of operant procedures in the social work curriculum and Burt Shachter deals with the client as a collaborator in social work teaching. (JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED130583

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Teaching for Competence in the Delivery of Direct Services

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Council on Social
Work Education
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

HE008354

COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION
New York

2

Copyright © 1976 by the Council on Social Work Education, Inc.

All Rights Reserved.

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 75-44609.

Printed in the United States of America.

The opinions expressed in this publication are solely those of the contributors and do not necessarily reflect the policy or position of the Council on Social Work Education. No official endorsement of the views presented should be inferred unless it is so indicated.

Council on Social Work Education, 345 E. 46th St., N.Y., N.Y. 10017

◆

Foreword

Enhancing practitioner competence in the delivery of direct services continues to be a prime concern of social work practitioners and educators alike. As the profession strives to maximize the utilization and effectiveness of its services, it is essential that efforts to upgrade the quality of its training in direct practice be maintained.

In publishing this volume the Council on Social Work Education reaffirms its long-standing commitment to the teaching of social work practice. This document contains eleven articles that offer challenging insights in a broad range of areas pertaining to teaching direct intervention theories and skills. The selected works are timely and innovative. They provide a rich perspective that is likely to stimulate and guide readers who seek useful new ideas about training for practice.

The Council believes that this book will prove to be an important resource for all who endeavor to improve the competence of practitioners and, consequently, the practice of social work.

RICHARD LODGE
Executive Director

Contents

Foreword iii

Games Social Work Educators Play in Teaching Practice Theories
Joseph D. Anderson 1

Preparing for Practice: Field Experience and Course Work in the Undergraduate Social Work Program
Robert T. Constable 9

Education for Generalist Practice: A Comparative Analysis of Current Modalities
Charles Garvin 18

Teaching an Ecological Perspective for Social Work Practice
Carel Germain 31

Social Work Practice Models: Teaching the Differential Aspects of Practice
Louise C. Johnson 40

Evaluating Time and Achievement in a Social Work Practicum
John Korbelik and Laura Epstein 51

Human Functioning as an Interpersonal Whole: The Dimensions of Affect, Behavior, and Cognition
Henry W. Maier 60

Teaching Casework Skills in the Laboratory: Methods and Techniques
Nazneen S. Mayadas and Donald E. O'Brien 72

Technology and Social Casework: A Review of the Literature
Donald E. O'Brien and Nazneen S. Mayadas 83

The Place of Operant Procedures in the Social Work Curriculum
Arthur Schwartz 95

The Client As a Collaborator in Social Work Teaching
Burt Shachter 107

Games Social Work Educators Play in Teaching Practice Theories

by
JOSEPH D. ANDERSON

INTRODUCTION

Social work has never really come to terms with its need to develop a practice theory. Harris Chaiklin has suggested that social work practice theory has structural similarities to unmarried motherhood: "everyone complains about it; attempts to use current definitions of the "problem" as a basis for intervening to change behavior fail because of inadequate conceptualization; and the profession derives a sado-masochistic pleasure from its repetition compulsion to use procedures which it knows do not work."[1] Yet unlike unmarried motherhood, social work practice theory impresses one as being "a little pregnant" while never really aborting or gestating fully.

The history of theory building in social work would seem to be in agreement with the statement of Kurt Lewin that "there is nothing so practical as a good theory.[2] Much work has been advanced toward building a theory base for social work practice. Gordon Hearn, who has remained a foremost proponent of theory building for social work practice, has advised that "social workers need to know all theories, love a few, and marry none."[3] This advice seems especially

Joseph D. Anderson is an associate professor and chairman of the Social Welfare Department, Shippensburg State College, Shippensburg, Pennsylvania.

unheeded in practice. Discouraged over the early unhappy marriage to functional or diagnostic practice theories, we are approaching the noncommitted anarchy of eclecticism. There is a growing diffusiveness for the practitioner that verges on the abandonment of a theory-based accountability for competent practice. Social work education bears a major responsibility for contributing to this conceptual anarchy.

This paper suggests that a great deal of social work education's influence on the powerlessness of the practitioner in using, testing, and developing a practice theory is to be found in the approaches used to teach social work practice. A game model is suggested as an explanation for the discrepancy between our call for a practice theory and our inability to prepare students for practice. As Eric Berne has written:

> A game is an ongoing series of complementary ulterior transactions progressing to a well-defined predictable outcome. Descriptively it is a recurring set of transactions, often repetitious, superficially plausible, with a concealed motivation; or, more colloquially, a series of moves with a snare, or "gimmick."[4]

Games have essentially two distinguishing characteristics: an ulterior quality and a payoff. The remainder of this paper prescribes games that social work educators can play in teaching practice theories. The author has been both a party to and purveyor of several of these in his own social work educational experience. Some have been gleaned from the literature and some from observation of and discussions with colleagues. The ulterior quality is the illusion that we are preparing effective practitioners without actually developing and testing practice theories. The payoff is the safety of noncommitment.

Ten of these games are presented below and are followed by the author's current position on teaching practice theories called the Leveling or No-Game Game. In this game ulterior transactions are absent and the payoff is the development of accountable service to client systems.

GAMES SOCIAL WORK EDUCATORS CAN PLAY

Find the Pony Game

Social work students are told that there are no current theories for practice. It is their job to develop one – both for themselves and for the profession. Like the little boy who enters a room full of horse manure, they are to shovel their way through a deluge of reading assignments to find the hoped-for pony. In a more sophisticated version of this game, the flaws in all existing practice theories are emphasized with intellectual elegance. All of the ideal criteria for theory construction are used. This paints a neat, nonhorse manurish picture of what they should find. Then the student is set free to seek the pony.

They're All the Same Game

Social work students are encouraged to be generic and to seek only similarities in competing theories. The functional-diagnostic debate can be introduced as an example of how profession-splitting conflicts can develop if differences are recognized. Inherent contradictions in theories can be dealt with by introducing the highest level of abstraction that will compromise differences.[5] Here is a suggested abstraction: man is a biological, psychological, sociological, political, and economic creature affected by both inside and outside forces, and different theories merely emphasize different variables that constitute man in his society.[6]

It Doesn't Matter Game

Social work students are expected to develop their creative selves and not worry about why they do what they do since experience itself is the best teacher for effective practice. Research is introduced showing that experienced practitioners, regardless of school of thought, essentially do the same things in practice.[7] Additional ammunition may be provided by social psychology studies showing that we all carry around an "implicit personality theory" that serves as a cognitive filter for our perception and responses.[8] This theory stems from our early experience with others and is so internalized that it probably cannot be altered. The student can be encouraged not to question this but to use it as part of the creative self that has successfully brought him this far in life.

The Facts Speak for Themselves Game

Students are not encouraged to think theoretically. Practice is to be based on the factual findings of research. Memorization of all important facts in research findings can be used to guide decision making in practice. The key is learning what .05 means. Students are taught to seek this symbol in volumes of research reports. They can learn to skim quickly through the literature and build a factual base for practice. One *caveat:* never expose students to a knowledgeable statistician who can destroy their faith in the .05. Without this faith they will be left with nothing.

The Do as I Say Not as I Do Game

Social work students are required to state and operationalize their theory for practice without the faculty person ever exposing his own. This game is usually set in the message context of "I've already been there. I've got it together. I don't have to go through this conceptualization process any longer. You'll get here too if you start to state your practice theories and relate these to your practice." The faculty person listens to everyone else's practice ideas and remains noncommital to any of them. Commitment might be exposing.

The Grand Theory Game

Social work students are exposed to one theory that proposes to answer all demands of all practice situations. Other theories are introduced for the explicit purpose of exposing their limitations. Students suggesting alternative theoretical explanations are shown to be ignorant of the elegant and precise elements of a good theory. These elements of the grand theory are then used to illustrate that the students' survival depends on its acceptance.

The Use What Works Game

Social work students are taught techniques that are time- and research-tested without any theoretical explanation of why they work. It does not matter that if at times they do not work and the student does not know why. Emphasis is on research, usually with small samples (N=1) illustrating concrete behavior in specific situations. Techniques, not conditions, are emphasized for generalization. The most important question is: What works? Never ask: What methods, based on what theory, with what workers, working with what clients, with what kinds of problems, in what situations are most successful?[9] This may distract from the assumptions of techniques that work most of the time with *some* clients in *some* situations. Here, too, value questions should be avoided. If manipulation works, use it. If lobotomy. . . . Finally, the significance of results should not be questioned. What may be discovered is that what works best only works toward outcomes that are insignificant anyway.

Try Everything at Least Once Game

Social work students are encouraged to know all theories and to experiment with them. If one theoretical approach does not work in a situation, they are told to switch to another, *ad infinitum.* Credit is always given to the last theory used regardless of whether a specific combination worked or the client merely got so tired being a guinea pig that he changed to justify leaving the game.

The Ivory Tower Game

Social work students are taught a complex intellectual framework developed by the faculty person, who has long ago blown the ashes of his own practice to the winds and has been adding to a theoretical framework ever since. Exquisite new phrases evolving out of discussions are constantly being added to the developing intellectual structure. Students who seem disinterested in the ambiguous and irrelevant material of the theory are labelled as intellectually lazy. Concepts from social science theory that introduce mysterious jargon (such as cybernetic systems or mathematical games) can be used as a legitimatizing base for this theory and will add suitably to the intrigue.

The Who Says Game

Social work students are taught to consider every theory from the sociology of knowledge perspective by asking "Who says?" after every theoretical formulation. Anyone developing or using a theory will soon see that it is a tenuous and relatively unimportant truth in the major sociopolitical arena. Almost every theory can be linked to serving particular vested interests, thereby discouraging further work on theory building. Students will invest less in the importance of theories used to guide practice once they recognize that theory building is but an impermanent game of games anyway. A danger of this game is that the players who have learned to play the game well can turn upon the faculty judge. When they begin to ask "Who says?" about the who says game, everyone may be driven to seek a higher faith in the unknown and make some existential choices regarding theories for professional practice.

The Leveling or No-Game Game

Social work students are introduced to several methods models for practice with explicit attention to the sociology of knowledge concepts related to the development of these models.[10] These are examined separately and comparatively with major assumptions, links to human behavior base, congruence with social work values, nature and quality of research supporting the model, and components of current uses in practice (where, with whom, for what problems, by whom, toward what outcomes).[11]

Students are encouraged to choose several models and to begin to operationalize these in practice. The theory-building and theory-testing process is taught and emphasis is placed on developing strategy hypotheses, first deductively and then inductively in practice.[12] Written assignments include the explication of theory and derived strategy hypotheses, as well as how these hypotheses are related to behavior in evaluation of outcomes.

For example, the problem-solving model for practice includes a strategy hypothesis that can be stated thus: if the worker helps the client determine the presenting problem, the client will become engaged in the process of working on his problem. The concepts of presenting problem and engagement require operationalization or explication of the behaviors to which the concepts refer. The essential question for testing this hypothesis in practice is "How do I know a presenting problem or client engagement when I see them?"

Faculty need to share their own theoretical framework and offer an example of an overriding framework that shows how different theoretical models are related to each other and to interventive strategies. This framework will be most useful if it is built on different client system goals.[13]

The uses of theory for effective practice can be taught both didactically and experientially through identifying the theoretical base and the predictions inherent in assessment and intervention plans. Conceptualization of the student's developing art of practice is also encouraged. The student is helped to formulate hypotheses based on his own impressions and awareness of self as an instrument. In this process, concepts representing patterned impressions are linked together. When existing theory bases for these hypotheses are known, they are given to the student for further exploration.

For instance, the student may discover that a particular client behavior is especially irritating within a clinical situation. This gut-level reaction may serve as a useful clinical transactional diagnostic tool. Perhaps the student links this feeling to the client's attempts to thwart the contractual outcomes of the transaction. If the student develops an hypothesis that this phenomenon relates to interpersonal tactics, he may find the theoretical work of Sullivan or Haley especially meaningful for action principles in this kind of situation.[14]

In this no-game, students and faculty together can identify the unknowns in practice situations and attempt to identify existing theoretical gaps toward developing needed theory for guiding interventions. Finally, both students and faculty are continuously working on explicating their practice theories, applying the theoretical hypotheses to assessment and intervention plans, and developing instruments to guide this planning, assess both process and final outcomes, and use practice data for testing and developing theory. Mutual profit is derived from the fact that theory can be tested adequately only in the real world of practice,[15] and that there is nothing more practical for the social worker than a good theory.

SUMMARY

A tradition of "almost pregnant" practice models has developed within social work practice. However, current attempts to build practice theories have been relatively fruitless, in part because of the games social work educators play in teaching practice theory. With the proliferation of theory-building and research in the social sciences, we are particularly susceptible to abandoning the testing of those models that have grown out of the social work experience or to abandoning the need for developing a practice theory altogether.

We can stop these self-defeating games and help students develop theory that will be useful to them in their practice. This objective requires a commitment both to using particular models in practice and to continually testing and developing them. The objective is the development of effective, accountable practice. The payoff will come in benefits to those we are committed to serve.

NOTES

1. Harris Chaiklin, "Social System, Personality System, and Practice Theory," *Social Work Practice 1969* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969), p. 1.
2. Alfred Marrow, *The Practical Theorist* (New York: Basic Books, 1967), p. ii.
3. Gordon Hearn, *Theory Building in Social Work* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958), p. 7.
4. Eric Berne, *Games People Play* (New York: Grove Press, 1964), p. 48.
5. This seems to be a favorite game maneuver for summarizing anthologies of different theoretical frameworks. See Bernece K. Simon , "Social Casework Theory: An Overview," in *Theories of Social Casework,"* ed. R. W. Roberts and K. H. Nee (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), pp. 353-94; and Francis J. Turner, "An Overview," in *Social Work Treatment: Interlocking Theoretical Approaches,* ed. F. J. Turner (New York: Free Press, 1974), pp. 495-507.
6. In playing this game do not let students read Jerome D. Frank, who writes: "the advance of both knowledge and practice is probably better served by members of different schools defending their own positions, while being tolerant of other schools, than by being uncritically eclectic . . . . As an eminent philosopher wisely said 'A clash of doctrines is not a disaster – it is an opportunity.' The activity stimulated by the clash of psychotherapeutic doctrines will eventually yield sufficient information either to prove that they are to all practical purposes similar or to clarify and substantiate differences between them." Jerome D. Frank, *Persuasion and Healing* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1961), pp. 232-33.

7. A classic here is Fred E. Fieldler, "A Comparison of Therapeutic Relationships in Psychoanalytic, Non-Directive, and Adlerian Therapy," *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, Vol. 14, No. 6 (June 1950), pp. 436-48.
8. An excellent teaching tool for the use of implicit personality theory in clinical practice is Kenneth Bullmer, *Improving Your Interpersonal Perceptual Skills* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1970).
9. See Joel Fischer, "A Framework for the Analysis and Comparison of Clinical Theories of Induced Change," *Social Service Review*, Vol. 46, No. 5 (May 1971), p. 449.
10. See especially those included in Robert Morris et al., *Encyclopedia of Social Work*, vols. I and II (New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971). Under social casework see the functional, problem-solving, psychosocial, and behavioral approaches; under social groupwork see the developmental, interactionist, and preventitive and rehabilitative approaches. Also see crisis intervention and family therapy.
11. See Fischer, *op. cit.*, pp. 440-54.
12. For explication of this theory-building process and the usefulness of strategy hypotheses, see Martin Bloom, "The Selection of Knowledge from Other Disciplines and its Integration into Social Work Curricula," *Journal of Education for Social Work*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (Spring 1969), pp. 15-27.
13. An excellent beginning framework for this is developed by Donald F. Krill, "A Framework for Determining Client Modifiability," *Social Casework*, Vol. 40, No. 11 (November 1968), pp. 602-11.
14. Harry Stack Sullivan, *The Collected Works*, vol. 1 (New York: W. W. Norton, 1953); and Jay Haley, *Strategies of Psychotherapy* (New York: Grune and Stratton, 1963).
15. For further explication of this position, see William C. Brennan, "The Practitioner as Theoretician," *Journal of Education for Social Work*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (Spring 1973), pp. 5-12.

Preparing for Practice: Field Experience and Course Work in the Undergraduate Social Work Program

by
ROBERT T. CONSTABLE

Since 1971 a key objective of approved undergraduate programs in social work has been preparation for practice.[1] This differentiates approved programs from the preprofessional programs, which assume that the student becomes a social work practitioner only after his educational experience. With the objective of preparation for practice, the undergraduate program focuses on preparing the student to become a social worker *during* the educational experience.

The concept of the undergraduate practitioner moves away from traditional thinking about undergraduate education, which has been both generalized and removed from living outputs. It was assumed that effective education should avoid a vocational emphasis or involvement with real problems. The specialization inherent in the arts and sciences further removes the student from alternative ways of knowing and from living experiences. This system effectively reinforces popular stereotypes about student's abilities and further

Robert T. Constable is an associate professor and associate director, Jane Addams School of Social Work, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle. He was a professor in the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, West Chester State College, West Chester, Pennsylvania, when this paper was written.

separates undergraduate from graduate education.

The degree to which we routinely stereotype undergraduate education becomes clear in any direct experience with undergraduates and undergraduate programs. It is possible for the undergraduate to achieve a considerable degree of practice competency without ignoring the aims of liberal education. On the other hand, this cannot be accomplished without programming geared specifically to undergraduate needs.

It is not necessary or even desirable to transpose parts of the graduate model into the undergraduate program without taking into account some of the inherent differences. The great advantage of the undergraduate program is that students have three years in which to mature intellectually emotionally before they begin their senior practice experience. Growth and self-screening processes may take place through a series of preparatory experiences during these three years. While the master's program involves the student in both practice and classroom experiences from the beginning, the baccalaureate program offers a variety of course and field experiences before the student is faced with practice responsibility. The undergraduate program screens students through careful evaluation of these anticipatory field experiences.

The social welfare program at West Chester State College is conceptualized as a testing-out process over four years with progressive levels of responsibility and choice. Each level involves both field and classroom content beginning with the sophomore year. The student is able to integrate learning on his own level without having to deal with a more complex set of expectations. This learning process allows time for change and growth. It avoids the immobilizing, negative anxiety sometimes found in graduate programs, which may be symptomatic of too many demands for change being placed on the student at one time.

On the other hand, early and graduated involvement with the field demands a degree of personal involvement and responsibility for learning. The mere observation of reality without responsible involvement in it is not enough. A student may have a variety of motivations for entering social work but may not always be prepared for what it involves. The student may lack the experience and criteria upon which to base his decision. These problems, common to the undergraduate level, may be dealt with through program advisement and careful screening.

What the undergraduate student lacks in direct life experience is often balanced by a willingness to learn and a basic awareness of human feelings and relationships. He often shows flexibility and learns quickly since he has few set patterns of acting or perceiving to overcome. He is often more ready to recognize the discontinuities, inconsistencies, and gaps involved in services than the older student. His reaction to these gaps is often more constructive. Extending the learning process over a period of time is particularly helpful in developing these natural assets.

West Chester's social welfare program has experimented with partialization of program objectives over a three-year time frame and with articulation of field and course work. The approach involves three levels of integrative learning in both field and classroom. The different tasks involved at each level are stressed, and the accomplishments at each level are a prelude to the next. The student is given an opportunity to test classroom experience in the field.

The program conceptualizes the task of the student on three major levels:

1. *Acquisition of information, observation, and choice.* At this level the student learns to observe, brings together information, and ultimately chooses whether he desires further involvement with the social welfare program. Knowledge acquisition is general and somewhat factual. This level also involves direct personal exposure to the field, practice experience, the ethical responsibility of gathering information on human services, and the ability to develop appropriate focus on a question within the context of knowledge already developed in the professional literature.
2. *Conceptualization with involvement.* The student's understanding of human behavior, the social environment, social work practice, and social welfare systems deepens to the point where he begins to identify commonalities underlying each of these areas and apply them to specific situations. His growing analytic competence is balanced by a beginning experience in a helping role within an agency or with another human being. He experiences the demands of a helping relationship and the responsibility of carrying out a function. He is able to relate this experience to course work and learn from it.
3. *Taking on the role of a practitioner.* The student integrates experiences, knowledge, values, and skills acquired into the formation of a professional self through carrying out the role of a professional social worker with supervision. The student initially struggles to master the expectations of the role. As he begins to master it he becomes aware of self and realizes that he influences the role. This awareness of his own strengths and limitations redefines and personalizes the educational experience. The student's experience sets the stage for beginning professional competence.

Each level stands on its own but prepares for the next. Each represents a further commitment and testing of the self. With each testing the student may, in fact, meet the demands only with great difficulty. The task associated with each level are integrated with both field and classroom. Concept development occurs in the context of real and actual situations. At any level the student may decide not to continue. In this case the program also would have achieved its purpose.

The actual operation of these levels can be seen best in the details of course and field experiences and in the way students make use of them. Level 1 involves acquisition of information, observation, and choice. This is the student's beginning experience in both field and classroom. Class activity is focused on a beginning social work course dealing with history, fields of practice, and methods. Field observation originally was limited to field trips, guest lectures, and papers involving observation. We found that this did not really allow the student to get involved with what he was observing, test his own observations, or become aware of his own learning process. Furthermore, students are generally trained to think in static abstractions and find the complex and interacting systems characteristic of practice difficult to understand. The student may have unrealistic, untested assumptions about self and the field, and could defer facing some of the realities until too late.

The beginning student should enter the field as soon as possible, since there is much to be gained by an in-depth observation of a social worker in practice. A preceptor would help the student face some of the issues involved in his observation. Feedback also would be helpful for admissions and screening purposes. In four sessions the preceptor would acquaint the student with the agency and help him develop a workable focus so that he could write a paper from the experience. The student's own performance in the process of observation would be rated on:

1. Cognitive and empathic grasp of the process of service.
2. Perception of the relationship of agency to both client and community systems.
3. Responsibility regarding function as a social work student and future professional through his preparation, use of time, and ability to question.
4. Self-awareness.

The preceptor would participate in the decision to admit the student to the program. The following examples will illustrate the operations of the Level 1 field experience described above.

LEVEL 1 – SOPHOMORE

Karen, a bright student with evident leadership qualities, transferred into social welfare only after some consideration. She had previously found a volunteer tutoring project with Black children a particularly moving and meaningful experience. She took on both class and field with great enthusiasm. In her field observation experience at a child welfare agency she developed a particular interest in a reaching-out experiment. She looked into every aspect of the project, talked with resource people, attended meetings, and eventually wrote a paper that was used by the agency. She felt that the chance to observe a person actually working in child welfare and to see herself in a similar role was the most valuable experience of the observation. Her affirmation of the experience seemed to release and focus her considerable creative ability.

Joan had always "just assumed" that she would be a social worker with little questioning, although she did not really know what a social worker did. Her classroom participation was limited and indicated some rather rigid and stereotyped ideas about people with problems. The field observation experience in a home for predelinquent adolescent girls helped her become aware of many of her own fears and see how deeply she rejected differences in others. She admired her preceptor to some extent, but could not understand how a person could be so even and flexible. As a result of the experience she decided to transfer to another major.

Corinne had recently transferred from a community college and had a specific plan to work with children. She was quiet, sensitive, and somewhat fearful of participation in a class group. Despite the specificity of her interests she held herself back from personal involvement or development of her own goals apart from class expectations. Her observation experience in a child welfare agency developed her interest in the abused child. An enthusiastic and well-prepared participant in the sessions with her preceptor, she found that the field was a place where she could test and define her interests, and where her learning process could take on a personal meaning.

Toward the end of the semester she participated somewhat more in class and discussed her increasingly specific goals with both her faculty advisor and the coordinator of field placement. She gradually discovered that her sensitivity could be put to use in social work. Her final paper reflected this growing awareness and self-confidence. Her choice to continue in the program was consciously made and was reflected in her achievement.

Carol was a woman in her late forties with considerable experience in working with the aging. Her decision to go to school full time in social welfare was reached only after some thought. But she found it difficult to take on a student role. Her field observation was in a volunteer service center with a preceptor who furnished a particularly good model of personal and professional creativity. As a result of this experience, Carol produced a particularly good paper on "Use of Volunteers with the Aging." Her experiences and achievement outside the class helped her claim her own interests and realize a greater feeling of self-acceptance.

LEVEL 2 – JUNIOR

The junior year brings about a sharpening and deepening of the student's knowledge and commitment. He is involved in theory courses dealing with social work practice and the operation of social welfare systems, programs, and policies. He is learning to utilize and integrate social science concepts, particularly in psychology and sociology. His field experience will involve him with other human beings in some direct, volunteer type of activity, one day a week for one semester. Both social work practice and social welfare systems courses make heavy use of observations and insight gained from the field experience. Conceptual learning proceeds rapidly and the student is able to observe and become involved without carrying the total responsibility of a practitioner. What might otherwise seem to be abstractions in practice and systems courses take on considerable meaning. The student acquires a clearer view of himself in operation and again confronts the question of his involvement with the field. Goals of the Level 2 field experience reflected in the evaluation are:

1. The student learns to actively engage in a defined, helping role in the agency.
2. The student learns an appreciation of the dynamics of the limitations in his role.
3. The student begins to see the relationship of the agency's service to human problems while learning what goes into the process of service delivery.
4. The student learns the various functions of a professional team as he carries them out in his own role.
5. The student develops an awareness of community needs, the degree to which the agency meets them, and the degree to which some of them remain unanswered.

The following examples illustrate the different nature of the learning tasks that emerge at this level.

Ruth was a bright, enthusiastic, high achieving, former psychology major who found that her beginning social work classes were compatible with her own sensitivity, intelligence, and need to give to others. Her junior field placement was at a state school for the retarded. She was assigned a group of severely retarded adolescents who essentially needed elementary personal care, which the institution had difficulty providing. Initially she was disappointed over what seemed to be a hopeless situation, a rather menial task, and an implicitly hostile attitude from other staff, but forced herself to continue. At one point she noticed that the retarded adolescents were remembering her from week to week. Her whole attitude changed and she began to understand what it meant to give something tangible. This change also was reflected in her feelings about other staff. Her classroom performance, always adequate, took on a new dimension from this learning experience.

Julia was a shy girl who came from a fairly protected background and had wanted to be a social worker for as long as she could remember. She had a great need to give to others and was the first to become involved in a cause. On the other hand, she had little real confidence in herself and was overshadowed by others. Her beginning learning experiences in social work were painfully limited by this quality but nevertheless she felt able to go on to the junior level. Her junior placement as a tutor to severely deprived adolescent boys in an institution for delinquents was initially disappointing. Her initial feeling of rejection caused her to wonder what she had to offer. Her participation in the practice class showed a fine sensitivity and grasp of practice, and she seemed to be using the experience to look at herself. As she gradually began to feel more competent her classwork improved and she became more able to take in other's experiences along with her own.

Candace performed at a borderline level in her introductory course and in her field observation. However, she had very evident capacity and it was felt that she might establish a clearer direction the following year. Her junior field placement was as a tutor at the school for delinquents where Julia worked. In contrast to Julia, Candace was only minimally aware of her limitations in working with adolescents. She seemed to be withdrawing and her attendance at classes was poor. The institution did not see her as productive and had to request that she improve her personal appearance. Her performance in class and the field was not satisfactory. She was not allowed a senior field placement and chose another field.

Joe was a husky athlete who got through the beginning class only with some difficulty. He gradually became aware of his half-suppressed sensitivity and found it very useful in understanding class and field observation. In the junior year he maintained his gradual growth in a practice and social welfare systems class. His field placement was a tutorial assignment in the institution for delinquents described above. He found that working with delinquents who were hard to reach reactivated the pain of his old experiences of being beaten up by youngsters in his urban high school. This caused him to skip placement and seek a counselor who had helped him previously. Later he told his faculty advisor of his problem. His previous experiences, relationship with his family, and fear of failure all came spilling out in this conference. It was crucial that he go back and test himself again. He did this with misgiving and found that he did have potential to work with youngsters such as these.

LEVEL 3 – SENIOR

While Level 2 is strongly concerned with course work, Level 3 emphasizes the field. The student is given a professional social work placement in direct service to clients two days a week for two semesters. He must carry a degree of responsibility on a par with other professional social workers in the agency and be evaluated with criteria similar to that the agency uses for its professional workers.

Social work courses at this level consist of concurrent integrative seminars. These seminars do not introduce new material but focus on the student learning from his own process. Through a series of structured case presentations the student learns to evaluate his own work and that of others. In the process he is integrating much of the previous course material into a professional role. As a student becomes more secure in this role, the focus shifts to his characteristic ways of dealing with clients. Identifying his own growth process often represents a dramatic and positive movement for the student into his professional role. Senior placement is very similar to the first year master's experience. The following examples illustrate portions of this process.

Marie had a tendency to be overwhelmed by the feelings of others. Her senior year placement in a general hospital setting brought her into sharp confrontation with human suffering. She had to deal with intense feelings as well as her own development and self-awareness. Initially it was evident that Marie tended to relate in a rather rigid way to both patient and supervisor. As she dealt with this she found that the seminar class helped her clarify her feelings and develop a greater understanding of other students' case material as well as her own. In the second semester Marie blossomed. She outgrew many of the previous self-doubts and uncertainties. This dramatic change was confirmed in her continuing performance.

Lea's high achievement was balanced by a driving, inner-directed need for perfection and affirmation by others. Her defensiveness about learning and engaging in a purposeful but free process with others came out in her field experience at a psychiatric hospital and in a seminar. Her patients made seemingly small gains, and her classmates felt her need to be in control prevented her from recognizing the feelings of others. She came to terms with her patients and their humanity when she began to come to terms with herself and human limitations in general. Her increasing awareness of her limitations enabled her to give sensitive help to others.

The senior experience is a success if the student learns to take on the demands of practice and come to terms with himself in order to sustain that direction. For this to occur, the program must invest a great deal in the student's experience. The program need not modify the possibility of a real confrontation with a demanding practice experience. Preparation over several years for this experience is crucial. With Level 1 and 2 experiences the student becomes involved more quickly and has a longer period to test and establish himself as a social worker.

Support for the student's learning in the form of concurrent seminars and individual sessions with faculty advisors is equally crucial. The seminar and other course work allows for a generalization of the level of experience which the class is going through. A learning to learn process takes place as the student perceives a connection between knowing and doing. The final connection will be made through the involvement with his advisor.

Learning activity, in the field or in the classroom, can be an experience geared to certain purposes. Perception of these purposes in a broad sense by both student and faculty allows the process of learning to proceed in realizable steps. It is this mutual perception of purpose that defines the learning experience and allows it to move toward an otherwise inaccessible goal. Preparation for practice is a feasible goal for undergraduate social work programs.

NOTE

1. Council on Social Work Education, *Undergraduate Programs in Social Work*, (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1971), pp. 11-12.

Education for Generalist Practice: A Comparative Analysis of Current Modalities

by
CHARLES GARVIN

A recent compilation of concentrations in graduate schools of social work indicated that 62 schools had developed some form of integrated or generalist training for practice in at least the first graduate year.[1] A body of work has also emerged that provides a conceptual framework for such curricula. Key concepts and organizing principles of this literature were utilized by the author to draw upon available experience, research, and theory in order to explicate a generalist or integrated approach. The purpose of this paper is to compare these modalities so that their use in the curriculum will be more explicit and their propositions for practice will be explicated and tested.

The comparison of various writings was complicated by the lack of consensus on a definition of the terms "generalist" and "integrated method," except that the former usually characterized the practitioner and the latter an approach to training. It is unclear how great an array of tasks is encompassed in generalist practice, or whether integrated method is based on a combination of previous methods or a new approach to social work practice.

In this paper, these questions will be regarded as open ones in which varying views among the writers reviewed will be described.

Charles Garvin is a professor of social work at the University of Michigan School of Social Work.

Nevertheless, a working definition was established in order to limit the scope of this inquiry. Generalist practice was defined as a social worker's activity that included interventions with individuals, groups, and larger systems. Integrated method was any approach to combining social work procedures or processes for work with individuals and larger aggregates. Such a combination could either combine the methods of such disciplines as casework and groupwork, or reconceptualize practice in different terms altogether.

THREE MODALITIES IDENTIFIED

In comparing different approaches to generalist practice, it soon became clear that no one writer represented an exclusive school of thought but rather that each one utilized different amalgams of a limited number of modalities. In describing these modalities, however, a classification of authors who appeared closest to the "type" was utilized for illustrative purposes, though it was recognized that this might not do justice to the comprehensiveness of each formulation.

The three modalities ascertained were termed a *task model*, a *social systems model*, and a *social psychological model*. In this paper we will define the models and then compare them on a set of variables reflecting teaching and practice concerns. In the concluding portion of the paper the major contributions of each model to a more comprehensive conception of generalist practice will be summarized and some directions for curricula proposed.

The task model is utilized by those who seek to integrate social work method by first defining the tasks of the client and of the professional and then assembling knowledge, skills, and values required to achieve these tasks. As used by Studt,

> task means in its general sense, specified work, performed over time, for a purpose beyond satisfaction in the doing itself, and measured by requirements outside the person doing the work. As a practice concept it therefore permits us to think about a sequence of action in which major elements in social work practice – method, purpose, and value – operate simultaneously.[2]

In the task model, worker tasks articulate with sets of client tasks since the worker's task is the facilitation of client task attainment. Bartlett's work also is pertinent here, although her concept is used within a framework concerned with life tasks and coping efforts, while Studt uses the term in a broader sense. Bartlett states that:

> Here the problems presented by crucial life situations – whether the life cycles of individual growth or specific traumatic epi-

> sodes like illness – are conceived as tasks that must be met and dealt with in some way. The aspect with which social workers are most concerned is repeatedly described as the coping efforts of people to deal with these tasks.[3]

Reid and Epstein have based a comprehensive practice text upon the task concept but do not offer it as the linkage between the various levels of social work intervention efforts.[4] Thus the task concept can be seen as involving issues of development and crisis although other approaches to task are not precluded.

A second type of conceptualization, the social systems model, views social work practice in an integrated manner as the impact of specified types of change agent systems upon other systems that have either engaged the worker or in which the worker's intervention has been legitimated by an agency on behalf of client systems. This model encompasses a number of different approaches and it is often hard to tell whether differences exceed similarities. The similarity is that it utilizes the social systems concept to refer to human aggregates with boundaries, structures, and purposes. The term can then apply to those systems that include a client (e.g., the family) or a worker (e.g., the agency), or those affecting the client (e.g., the welfare department).

Pincus and Minahan utilize systems concepts primarily to identify aggregates that are appropriate sites of worker interaction – whether as client, as an action system to secure changes on behalf of the client system, or as a target system for such change.[5] The work of Hearn[6] and Northen[7] uses additional concepts of intrasystem processes and structures. Schwartz[8] and Shulman,[9] rather than visualizing a change agent system with many different functions, assign primacy to the worker's function of mediating between the relevant systems. These divergencies make the task of comparison more difficult, but some commonality of systems concepts as an approach to unifying practice theory will be assumed.

The third approach to integration ensues from a series of attempts to utilize selected social science concepts and is termed here the social psychological model. This modality draws heavily upon social science research regarding roles, small group structures, and social influence processes. The growing influence of behavior modification in clinical social work and of exchange theory in sociology is particularly relevant to this approach. Garvin and Glasser, for example, utilize the small group dynamics present in dyadic, family, and group situations as one vehicle for generating generic practice principles. The worker functions as an expert who utilizes this information to produce changes with or on behalf of the client.[10]

Siporin also uses concepts drawn from group theory and role theory. He states that "a social situation refers to a social group focalized in action at a certain time and place around some crucially relevant object, person, or goal." He adds that "we are concerned mainly with primary, small groups, but the groups may be informal and large: in gatherings, mobs, and social movements."[11] While the social psychological oriented theorists are not unmindful of systems concepts, there is a much greater focus upon the smaller, primary units within the more broadly identified systems.

THREE MODALITIES COMPARED

Now that we have briefly characterized three ways of integrating practice, we will proceed to compare them by discussing the following questions:

1. What should be the focus of social work practice? We borrow Bartlett's use of the term focus as "the problems and phenomena with which social work is concerned."[12]
2. What should be the role description of the social worker?
3. What should be the knowledge bases of practice?
4. What are the components of a professional action repertoire?
5. What are the implications of each modality for curriculum development?

The Focus of Social Work Practice

Those writers who utilize the task model place a strong emphasis on a set of values that outlines the focus of social work activity. Studt strongly subscribes to the position that the right of client self-determination prescribes that the client select goals and tasks to achieve goals. The worker's tasks are to "provide the conditions necessary for the client's work on his tasks." This is related to the emergence of a purpose common to worker and client and "the onus is on the worker to identify and establish the common base of purpose that allows him to achieve his professional goals through the client's pursuit of his."[13]

Bartlett, with her similar emphasis on self-determination, sees the enhancement of the client's growth, generated out of his coping efforts, as the focus of social work and explicates this process under her definition of the concept of social functioning. There is a basic similarity between Studt's emphasis on the necessary conditions for task attainment and Bartlett's contention that such attainment occurs when the balance is improved between people's coping and environmental demands. In the latter case the worker's attention is directed to coping phenomena, largely placed in ego psychology terms, and to the possibility of modifying environmental demands.

Within the social systems model, no writer rejects such values as self-determination. The focus of social work as enhancing social functioning, however, is not intrinsic to this model in Bartlett's sense. Advocates of this model don't necessarily see the client as an individual attempting to cope, but rather as a family, group, or even community. The client is viewed as a social system interacting with other systems and contracting with a change agent system. The focus of social work, then, tends to be viewed as helping relevant systems interact in such a manner that the degree to which the goals of each system are achieved is maximized. How these goals are viewed varies among theorists, with Gordon coming close to Siporin and Bartlett in that his central concern for social work is the "matching of people's coping patterns with the qualities of impinging environment for the purpose of producing growth-producing and environment-ameliorating transactions."[14] Polsky goes beyond this more traditional formulation to present a concept of functional systems as a social work goal.[15] This contribution solves a dilemma posed by Bartlett's social functioning concept that may be used as the focus of the clinically based worker but can be problematic when the community is viewed as the client.

The social psychological model, at least as presented by Garvin and Glasser, comes close to the professional task model in accepting social functioning as the focus of social work. Siporin, however, approaches Polsky's formulation in his concept of functional and dysfunctional situations. He notes that a social situation may be considered functional when it meets the needs of individuals and social systems. Therefore, the use of small group social psychological concepts can easily fit into a focus on individual functioning of clients or on the more sociologically presented situational concepts so fully developed by Siporin.

Role Descriptions of the Social Worker

In this section, the concern is with the tasks of the worker. An important aspect is the scope of worker activities. Does the worker, for example, primarily engage with one of the relevant systems or does his role performance extend across a range of systems? Another aspect concerns the types of role expectations placed upon the worker by the model and by persons interacting with the worker on the basis of the model.

Bartlett conceives of the worker's tasks as following a particular sequence: "the beginning is in social worker's ways of perceiving social situations, which takes into account the coping efforts of people to deal with life tasks and problems as related to the demands of their environment and the consequences to both if there is a serious imbalance." She then perceives the worker as proceeding to a "responsible assessment of the situation" and the use of an interventive repertoire on behalf of the client and the client's situation. She characterizes this interventive repertoire as belonging to the profession rather than to a method within social work. Nevertheless, Bartlett does not see workers utilizing all aspects of this repertoire and she admits that some "will place greater emphasis on giving direct services to the people coping with problems and others will emphasize bringing about changes in the social environment . . . " She does suggest, however, that as workers gain experience their interventive repertoire will be extended.[16]

In some ways, Bartlett's conception of the worker role comes close to a series of expectations that we have come to think of as traditional: the worker is responsible for assessing situations and planning interventions. These interventions are meant to facilitate client coping efforts. Interventions are no longer compartmentalized by method, since workers initially tend to specialize in segments of what Bartlett refers to as the interventive repertoire. She offers a plan for a common base for all practice in which the roles are not defined as those of caseworker or groupworker, but rather the entire interventive repertoire is considered and a single focus for practice is prescribed. To help with this, Bartlett, Studt, and Siporin introduced the concept of situation as a locus for intervention.

There are variations in how the social systems model prescribes the role of the worker. Some approaches, such as that of Pincus and Minahan, use systems theory as tools of analysis and planning to be utilized in any role the worker may assume, since they do not describe their model as a generalist one. In contrast, many of the writers included in Hearn's volume do have specific notions of what the worker's role should be. As Hearn states, in summarizing several papers:

> Lathrope, using his paradigm as a framework, shows that for all levels of human organization the worker may intervene at the point of input, in the internal processing, at the point of output, and in the feedback process. Shafer and Shulman explicate and illustrate the kinds of social work interventions that typically occur in what Lathrope refers to as "processing within the system." In short, social work activity is focused inside, outside, and at the boundary between the system and its environment.[17]

Hearn's approach presents a subtly different definition of the worker's role than the preceding model. The worker does not separately assess individuals and social situations. Rather, the worker as a system component is often located at the boundary between systems, such as between individuals and situations. The worker's emphasis is upon the kinds of transactions that take place between systems. The processes that take place within systems are viewed as affected by inputs from and outputs to other systems, and the role of the worker is, at least to Schwartz, to mediate and facilitate these systemic transactions. The assessment of internal systemic dynamics and the planning of change goals may even be seen as detrimental to the tasks of mediating between systems.

If the worker in the task model is primarily a facilitator of growth and in the social systems model a mediator between systems, in the social psychological model he is a change expert. Garvin and Glasser, whose generalist concept extends only to integrating interpersonal treatment approaches (i.e., casework and groupwork), parallel Bartlett's ordering of worker tasks. Their approach also identifies stages such as those involving assessment and intervention. The approach to assessment and intervention is not required to fit within a framework of coping efforts and related situations; rather, dysfunctional behavior of the client may be the target. While there is concern for a worker-client contract, the worker assumes the role of expert in selecting appropriate action systems (i.e., individual, family, or group) and in utilizing direct, indirect, and extra-client means of influence to attain stated goals. Siporin, although his formulation presents some clear-cut differences from that of Garvin and Glasser, also identifies a series of interventions that constitute the basis of the worker expertise (e.g., refocusing attention, change in behavior setting, group restructuring, and behavior change).

Behavior modification-oriented social workers also have become concerned recently with building a social work practice model. Thomas, for example, is working toward this in his treatment of behavioral approaches in casework and groupwork that emphasize worker expertise in the use of behavioral interventions.[18] These models all use social and behavioral science to suggest change procedures in order to arrive at agreed-upon goals.

Knowledge Bases of Practice

None of the writers quoted thus far in this paper would exclude any dimension of knowledge as being inapplicable to their practice approach. Neither do the modalities viewed as ideal types preclude any application of social science. Nevertheless, it is unlikely that any model can be a potpourri of all available information, since in each one certain concepts and theories are more basic than others.

In the task approach, at least as explicated by Bartlett, a strong emphasis is placed upon the social workers' development of knowledge growing out of their encounter with social work tasks. As Bartlett states: "These formulations should be in the form of distinctly social work propositions and generalizations, in other words, relating to the behavior of people under stress, the meaning of the situation to them, their efforts at coping, their ways of seeking and using help, and similar phenomena, all of which fall within the particular experience of social work."[19] The emphasis on coping, together with other formulations by this author, suggests a strong debt to ego psychology theory and it is evident that the task approach draws heavily on this set of concepts as a major organizing framework.

The social systems approach obviously utilizes systemic concepts and theory as a basis. As Shafer explains:

> In social systems theory, behavior is considered to be a consequence of the total social situation in which an individual subsystem, group subsystem, or other social unit finds itself. In a social situation, interacting social units form bounded systems which define a field consisting of social characteristics standing in definite relationship to each other and in which social units can be located. The systems themselves persist in time while the position of social units within them may change. The person in the family or group, the group in the community, and the community in society are illustrations of this construct.[20]

Shafer then draws upon additional systems concepts as a basis for practice propositions. He particularly focuses upon how an understanding of the processes of system equilibrium can lead to specific and operational principles of practice.

The social psychological model differs from the previous two in several ways. It does not have a specific focus on client coping efforts as related to environmental demands. Neither does it rely upon a framework, such as social systems theory, to link the processes taking place in relevant social aggregates. Rather it leaves less defined the specific kinds of transactions of primary concern to social workers and draws upon diverse sets of theories for different tasks. These theories include ego psychology, behavior modification, role theory, small group theory, and organizational theory. Siporin's work, as well as that of Glasser and Garvin, places a strong emphasis on small group theory in explaining the dynamics of client- and multiple client-worker engagements.

Components of a Professional Action Repertoire

In speaking of an action repertoire we are not referring to the kinds of knowledge the worker uses to decide what action to take when, nor are we speaking of the values underlying the legitimacy of using some actions under certain conditions. We are speaking of the activities of the worker in securing change in the client or his situation. Two issues are of concern: What should be the action repertoire of the worker? and How should it be described or categorized?

The task model is less concerned with the repertoire of the worker than the repertoire of the profession. The idea of a professional team is natural here and Studt's approach pictures a staff that plans and manages "the community program for the total agency caseload." She concludes that "a number of management roles heretofore reserved for administration were now delegated to the staff as a group . . ."[21] These interactions will presumably lead to an expansion of the repertoire of any individual and a possible reassignment of roles.

Bartlett sees some problems in defining the interventive repertoire of the profession, particularly when the activities of caseworkers and groupworkers are added to those of community workers and policy makers. She is concerned about how the interventions of the latter will fit within a social functioning framework and its related values. She states: "As social workers explore advocacy and activism, issues regarding social work's basic orientation must be faced."[22]

The interventive repertoire indicated by the systems model is difficult to identify since the model lends itself primarily to issues regarding the location and timing of interventions. It appears likely, however, that the repertoire will be heavily weighted toward actions to enhance communication, feedback, and negotiation. Actions identified as interpretation seem less appropriate. Problem-solving skills in relation to problems of systemic functioning and intersystem exchange will also be central.

The social psychological model lends itself to the explication of interventions since each theoretical input has intervention implications. Behaviorism suggests reinforcement and desensitization; cognitive theories lead to situational redefinition and refocusing attention; small-group theories point the way to group restructuring and rematching the individual and group.[23]

In comparing interventive approaches across models it appears that the social psychological model may have the most to offer in terms of clarifying interventions, although some writers would be happier if the terms were more indigenous to social work and if all the value concerns of social work were expressed in the selection and description of interventions. The social systems model is strongly relevant to the choice among interventions for all of the participants; the task model makes us most mindful of the value considerations in the choice of intervention and the appropriateness of interventions to the tasks and settings of social workers.

Implications of the Modality for Curriculum Development

Now that the three modalities have been compared in regard to substantive issues, some of the differences in curricula based on these models will be discussed. It would be useful if we had data on how schools that are related to each approach organize their curricula. In the absence of this data, we will offer some hypotheses. We will even be so presumptuous as to suggest that where the course organization is as described, the school is following the model whether it knows it or not.

The task model is likely to be dominant when the school organizes courses around social problems and related fields of practice. These schools offer their students an understanding of the tasks confronting different client systems and of the professional tasks in servicing these specified systems. In describing one such curriculum Mass states:

> The profession is able to educate and utilize social workers whose special purpose is the resolution of some of the social problems of disadvantaged children and/or youth, or the aged, or the ill and incapacitated. We have sizeable and developing bodies of theory and on-going research programs on forces which influence the lives of persons in these and related positions in our own and other societies. We have sizeable and growing bodies of literature on social policy and welfare provisions for persons in these positions . . . [24]

Within a task framework, Maas is describing a knowledge of the problems, tasks, and coping patterns of persons in particular types of situations and the professional tasks appropriate for these populations. He does not suggest the field experience associated with his conception. It follows, however, that the practicum associated with a professional task emphasis will allow the students to fulfill a number of tasks with individuals, groups, and larger aggregates related to the particular type of social problem they are studying and the client systems encountered in the related field of practice.

The social systems model is likely to be reinforced when courses are offered regarding aggregates of different levels of complexity (e.g., dyad, family, small group, organization, and community), and when each of these is analyzed in terms of internal systemic components and external linkages to other systems. For example, concepts such as subsystem, input, output, feedback, and homeostasis will be illustrated and analyzed in each course. Social systems in different practice areas will be compared in order to illuminate basic system concepts and propositions.

Shulman presents one case example of a field experience oriented to social systems theory.[25] As the field instructor, he stressed the systemic identification of a group of clients, the institution, and the society that sponsored the institution. Assumptions about one level of system were utilized by students as hypotheses about the nature of systems at other levels. It seemed to be less important that one field of practice was involved than that the students had the opportunity to generate and test hypotheses about systems and system exchanges.

The social psychological model is in operation when a suitable universe of basic social psychological concepts are identified and their use in practice engineered. The student is required to master the content of specific courses on personality theory, role theory, small-group theory, interpersonal influence, and formal organizations. The student examines the similarities and differences of how processes of role definition, group problem-solving, or behavioral control operate in dyads, small groups, and larger organizations. The small group components in particular are identified and utilized for change in each situation.

The student's field work is in agencies that operate on the basis of contracts for behavioral change in clients through the use of worker knowledge and expertise. The student is assigned to work with individuals, families, and groups of unrelated clients and is shown how to identify the common social-psychological elements in practice.

In the above propositions regarding the linkage between the model and the curriculum, major differences may occur in the organization of classes rather than in field experiences. All the models are geared to provide the student with a basis for work with individuals, groups, and organizations. The task model seeks to emphasize knowledge about particular populations, the social systems model about common systemic processes, and the social psychological model about appropriate social science concepts for change in particular person-situation configurations. The tasks confronting students in the field may be very similar, but the points or types of intervention they choose may differ substantially. Again, the reader should be reminded that we are dealing here with ideal types and that actual practice is likely to be a combination of these patterns. The effort should be to identify the model or models underlying curricular decisions.

CONCLUSION

Each of the three models presented here could offer an important contribution to an emerging generalist method. The task model provides excellent continuity with social work traditions and with widely accepted descriptions of the role of the social worker as enhancing social functioning. It has the advantage of providing for specificity of goals and activity to achieve such goals. One of the problems with the task model is its wealth of concepts on individual-situation transactions and its dearth of concepts related to larger systems.

The social systems model makes important contributions to the solution of this problem. The function of microsystem transactions within the larger system that may affect change operations can be analyzed through the use of system concepts. The social systems model may also be particularly useful in decisions regarding intervention targets. One of the limitations of the social systems model is its current lack of specificity regarding immediate processes and change operations.

The social psychological model with its behavioral change tools meets the practitioner's need for techniques and strategies of the moment. However, it needs to include professional task definitions and macrosystem considerations.

We do not wish to imply that we are ready to launch a method that incorporates all of the elements alluded to above. Rather the attempt of this paper is to clarify three sets of concepts regarding generalist practice. Teachers and practitioners can use this framework to clarify their own modalities and to determine how they have drawn upon and combined task, system, and social psychological approaches. The limitations of each approach can be addressed either by a combination of models or an expansion of existing models.

Finally, it is important to collect more data on the conceptualizations currently being used and the results of practice based upon these. Only then will we really be able to lay any valid claim to a generalist method in social work.

NOTES

1. "Concentrations and Special Learning Opportunities in the Master of Social Work Curricula of Graduate Schools of Social Work, 1972-73," mimeographed (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1972).
2. Elliot Studt, "Social Work Theory and Implications for the Practice of Methods," *Social Work Education Reporter,* Vol. 16, No. 2 (June 1968), p. 23.
3. Bartlett notes that after she wrote her book, she read Studt and recognized important similarities in approach. Harriet M. Bartlett, *The Common Base of Social Work Practice* (New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1970), p. 97.
4. William Reid and Laura Epstein, *Task Centered Casework* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972); and Charles Garvin, "Task-Centered Group Work," *Social Service Review,* Vol. 48, No. 4 (December 1974), pp. 494-507.
5. Allen Pincus and Anne Minahan, *Social Work Practice: Model and Method* (Itasca, Ill.: F.E. Peacock, 1973). Incidentally, these authors also make full use of the task concept.
6. Gordon Hearn, ed., *The General Systems Approach: Contributions Toward An Holistic Conception of Social Work* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1969).

7. Helen Northen, "An Integrated Practice Sequence in Social Work Education," *Social Work Education Reporter,* Vol. 16, No. 2 (June 1968), p. 29.
8. William Schwartz, "The Social Worker in the Group," *The Social Welfare Forum, 1961* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961).
9. Lawrence Shulman, *A Casebook of Social Work With Groups: The Mediating Model* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1968).
10. Charles Garvin and Paul Glasser, "The Bases of Social Treatment," *Social Work Practice, 1970* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), pp. 149-77.
11. Max Siporin, "Situational Assessment and Intervention," *Social Casework,* Vol. 53, No. 2 (February 1972), pp. 91-109. Also see Max Siporin, *Introduction to Social Work Practice* (New York: Macmillan, 1975), pp. 219-50.
12. Bartlett, *op. cit.,* p. 85.
13. Studt, *op. cit.,* p. 24.
14. William E. Gordon, "Basic Constructs for an Integrative and Generative Conception of Social Work," in Hearn, *op. cit.,* p. 10.
15. Howard Polsky, "System or Patient: Client Needs and System Function," in Hearn, *op. cit.,* pp. 12-25.
16. Bartlett, *op. cit.,* pp. 162 and 174.
17. Hearn, *op. cit.,* pp. 68-69.
18. Edwin J. Thomas, "Social Casework and Social Group Work: The Behavioral Modification Approach," in *Encyclopedia of Social Work,* vol. II (New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971), pp. 1226-37.
19. Bartlett, *op. cit.,* p. 75.
20. Carl M. Shafer, "Teaching Social Work Practice in an Integrated Course," in Hearn, *op. cit.,* pp. 31-32.
21. Studt, *op. cit.,* p. 43.
22. Bartlett, *op. cit.,* p. 188.
23. These intervention terms have been taken from Siporin, "Situational Assessment," *op. cit.,* pp. 106-107.
24. Henry S. Maas, "Purpose, Participation, and Education," in *Innovations in Teaching Social Work Practice,* ed. Lilian Ripple (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1970), pp. 34-57.
25. Lawrence Shulman, "Social Systems Theory in Field Instruction," in Hearn, *op. cit.,* pp. 37-44.

Teaching an Ecological Perspective for Social Work Practice

by
CAREL GERMAIN

This paper describes teaching an approach to practice that arises from a particular set of assumptions concerning the profession's social purpose, domain of practice, and theoretical frame of reference.

RATIONALE FOR CHANGE IN PERSPECTIVE

A continuing thread in the historical development of social work has been its dual concern with person-situation. Practice has tried to consider the mutual impact of man and milieu in understanding need, yet mutuality has often been obscured by either environmental or psychic determinism. Shifts from one element to the other in the unit of attention have occurred in response to new inputs of knowledge or ideology, to occupational and educational rewards and sanctions, and to events and processes in the larger society. Most often, however, a treatment emphasis on the person has been uppermost while the situation has been viewed as a fixed setting. This one-sidedness in viewing and handling phenomena has been attributed to conceptions of causality that have become outmoded, to the fear of reductionism, and to the very real difficulties in effecting situational change.

Whatever the reasons, social work practice, despite its commitment to the psychosocial point of view and its avowed concern for

Carel Germain is a professor at the Columbia University School of Social Work.

person-situation, has found it difficult to implement its dual concern at the level of direct service. Thus we struggle with the recurring dichotomies between environmental reform and individual change, purpose and process, and cause and function.[1] Their recurrence weakens us in the struggle to survive in a society that is increasingly hostile to social work and to those whom we serve. The ideological conflict overlooks the complementarity of person-situation that is essential for a profession concerned with human need at both the policy and practice levels.

The conception of practice that underlies the teaching described in this paper arises out of Gordon's formulations of the domain of social work.[2] In Gordon's view, transactional phenomena occurring at the interface between man and his environment comprise the unit of attention. This view adds dynamic properties to the two-dimensional linearity of person-situation that was characteristic of practice based on a medical-disease metaphor. In practce that arises from an ecological metaphor, the worker is concerned both with the coping qualities of the person and the qualities of the impinging dyadic, familial, group, organizational, and physical environments. Professional action is directed to matching coping patterns and environmental qualities in such a way that coping capacities are enhanced and the environment is meliorated. Professional outcomes are measured in terms of what is good for both the person and the environment.

This conception recognizes that the distinctiveness of social work is in the value-knowledge realm rather than in a method-skill formulation of practice. Gordon suggests that the central professional value is the right of every individual to realize his potential for growth and self-realization. This is a position consonant with modern conceptions of adaptation and evolution. Our traditional value position, largely derived from Judaic-Christian systems and the puritan ethic, emphasized a concern with normatively defined behaviors. The normative aspects made us susceptible to a social control function that violated our professional self-image, alienated the people using our services, and induced unrealistic expectations among legislators and the public. The new position supports the worth and dignity of the individual in significant new ways while recognizing the interdependence and reciprocal obligations of individual and society, and the coupling of freedom and responsibility.

Knowledge concepts bearing on the nature of transactions between man and milieu are available in disciplines now relatively untapped by social work education including evolutionary biology, cultural anthropology, and social psychology. New concepts are also developing in disciplines that social work has customarily drawn upon – for example, cognitive theory in dynamic psychology and organizational theory in sociology. These concepts and derivative principles are finding their way into social work curricula.

The emphasis on the value and knowledge bases of social work calls for a reconceptualization of practice more congruent with belief systems, social forms, and life experiences developing in the contemporary world.

THE SOCIAL CONTEXT

Behavioral scientists have called attention to the excessive demands that a rapidly changing, technological, mass-oriented society makes on the biologically-evolved adaptive limits of all its citizens.[3] Sustaining a feeling of competence in dealing with aspects of contemporary life is difficult even for those considered to be well-functioning. The difficulties are all but insurmountable, however, for those to whom the status of outsider has been ascribed – the poor, the aged, the dependent children, the deviant, and the victims of discrimination. For these citizens, any sense of competence in coping with the constantly changing environment and overcoming its lack of fitness for human need is eroded by experience, or by the the inadequate response of societal institutions designed to instill social competence (family, school, church, hospital, housing project, prison, etc.). Community institutions, programs, and services may be conceived of as channels for connecting citizens to the resources they require for adaptive and productive living. Too often these channels become clogged by pollution and adaptive needs are not met.

Pollution occurs in various types of environments. We are used to thinking of the technological pollution that despoils our natural world and upsets the ecological balance of organic systems. We are now beginning to understand that pollution of the social environment can occur when stigma is attached to age, race, or status and is intensified by the failure of social institutions to integrate or reintegrate outsiders into society. Pollution of the psychological environment can occur when loneliness, alienation, and despair accumulate as the systems and processes of urban life violate people's deepest human needs and isolate them from the world of nature. Pollution of the cultural environment can occur when passivity, standardization, and conformity take the place of creative activity, spontaneity, and autonomy because societal institutions fail to individualize people.

People may continue to exist under such conditions but the price of adaptation is mental and physical disease, increased regimentation, deviance, or lost zest for life. These pollutions must be reduced and the processes creating them must be reversed if humanness is to be preserved and human potential realized. How can social work practice become more responsive to the evolving needs generated by these imperatives?

THE ECOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Even before Earth Day 1970 the possibility of a new metaphor for the helping professions and a new organizing theme for the social sciences had come into view. The ecological perspective appeared in psychiatry, psychology, anthropology, and archaeology. While it had been an important concept in sociology for a long time, it originated in the life sciences. The current upsurge of interest in ecological thought reflects the widespread concern about the effects of technology, overpopulation, and greed on the safety and beauty of our world, and on issues of human survival and the quality of life. Beginning efforts by the helping professions to incorporate an ecological perspective into the practice base may also reflect the compatability of ecological thought with general systems theory. The latter framework has received attention in social work as a useful perspective on the organized complexity of living systems. Its level of abstraction, however, has made translation into practice principles difficult. For social work, the usefulness of an ecological metaphor also lies in its capacity to move practice theory and procedures toward a real complementarity of person-situation and to provide a base for teaching practice more holistically.

Whereas the medical-disease metaphor focused attention on individual pathology or defects, the ecological metaphor focuses on mutual processes of adaptation between the individual and his environment. Its emphasis on growth and potentiality leads quite naturally to a life model of practice different from the more traditional clinical model that was based on the earlier metaphor.[4] In addition to generating a new model, the ecological perspective is capable of embracing various and emerging practice approaches because it values differential responses to differential definitions of need as the hallmark of an individualizing service. No one approach is given greater overall sanction except in its particular fit with a particular problem definition. The great diversity of human needs, life styles, and situations requires multiple models for intervention. Such multiplicity can help counteract present dehumanizing trends in the human services.

What follows is not a new theory of practice. Rather, it is a way of organizing into an ecological frame of reference what we already know from relevant disciplines and from generalizable aspects of our own practice experience. Yet it may be useful to suggest how the ecological perspective influences practice and the teaching of practice. In a sense, both practice and the teaching of practice become metalogues of ecology.[5] They become activities occurring between person and situation (between client and worker, between students and teacher) that reflect and illustrate processes of adaptation and mutuality. The very transactions and principles examined and handled are exemplified in the way they are structured in helping and teaching.

In ecological terms, man and milieu are understood as complementary components of a system in which each continually and reciprocally shapes the other. Man and environment achieve a mutual fit through processes of adaptation. Environment refers not only to the physical world but also to the social and psychological world that man creates and to which he adapts.[6] Because of his evolutionary development, the human being's crucial adaptive task throughout life is in the area of human relatedness. The task of adapting to other humans is critical, for example, in the survival of the child. But failure to relate at any point in the life cycle can interfere with needed nutriment from and communication with the social environment. Such failures can lead to loneliness and alienation – or even to despair and death.

Common themes among the ego psychologists, cognitive theorists, socialization theorists, and biologists place emphasis on the environmental conditions required for the growth and achievement of potential. Physical, social, and cultural environments can provide an excess of unwelcome stimuli at one extreme or an impoverishing lack of diversified stimuli at the other. Certain biological and psychological potentialities are realized only if appropriate stimuli are received at the right time. Studies from ethology also suggest the need for environmental stimuli to occur at appropriate times in order for particular qualities and capacities to emerge, although reversability and compensations in human beings need more study.[7]

It is nevertheless clear that an ecological perspective in social work practice demands attention to the properties of the social and physical environment in which people function. This includes the quality and quantity of resources the environment offers as well as what the environment requires in order to be supportive of the human beings functioning within it. As methods of intervention into environmental systems continue to develop, they will require specialized knowledge and skill to a degree at least commensurate with that required for intervention in the intrapsychic realm.

In direct practice, social work has sought to individualize people and provide opportunities for them to master their life-situations in ways congruent with their distinctive life-styles. Now, however, this nebulous ideal is almost within reach of social work as the knowledge and tools for individualized intervention in a variety of systems are being developed – just as family and group approaches have demonstrated productive points of entry beyond the one-to-one. The school room, the place of employment, the social agency board room, the day care center, the police precinct, the hospital emergency room, the high-rise housing unit, and the SRO hotel – all viewed as ecological units of life space – are real-life situations that can be restructured with the active participation of those directly involved in order to provide a better adaptive fit to human needs, or experiences to promote growth.

In schools, for example, social workers are helping teachers conduct classroom meetings in which both the children and the teacher examine their shared interpersonal experiences as a way of promoting better adaptation. Wiener and his associates have demonstrated the feasibility of offering mental health services in the factories and lofts of the garment trade, using shop stewards for case finding, and defining needs and objectives in terms of job retention rather than pathology.[8] In day care centers, social workers are recruiting and guiding adolescent boys from ghetto high schools to serve as figures of male identification for young children. At the same time the youths are learning something about parenting and the rewards of generativity in the broad Ericksonian sense.

Social workers attached to police precincts are offering life-space interviews at the level of early intervention to help families struggling with acute interpersonal conflict or delinquent episodes. In a large metropolitan hospital, social workers are stationed around-the-clock in the emergency room where psychosocial needs are often presented as medical phenomena. Elsewhere in that hospital the social worker attached to the coronary care unit uses individual and group approaches with panic-stricken relatives in the waiting room. In SRO hotels the social worker offers individual and group services, and also engages management and tenants in a joint effort to improve their environment, thus strengthening adaptive capacities and meliorating the milieu.[9]

For these kinds of services and interventions to develop, a shift had to occur from the medical-disease perspective with its emphasis on a clinical mode of practice designed to effect change in the individual, to an ecological perspective with its emphasis on changing the transactions between the person and his environment.

THE APPROACH TO TEACHING

A third-semester doctoral seminar in social work practice was designed to meet student interest in reorganizing the knowledge base of practice and reorienting the practice itself, and to investigate the usefulness of an ecological metaphor for these purposes. Early sessions were devoted to developing a frame of reference through extensive reading, examination, and discussion of concepts from ecology, cultural anthropology, ethology, and ego psychology. Students made extensive use of their learning in the total doctoral program. Once the framework of organizing themes was agreed upon, students assumed responsibility for leading the group into a deeper examination of selected concepts and their implications for reorganizing knowledge and reorienting practice. These included the following foci:

1. Lewinian field theory, general systems theory, situational theory, and theories of adaptation were examined for their usefulness in redefining problems, locating assets for change, and expanding the arena of help.
2. Sets of ideas from the existential philosophers and the humanistic psychologists, and concepts from communications and information theory were examined for their implications for professional relationships.
3. Ideas concerning adult socialization were explored since these might relate to helping people define norms and values for themselves, cope with role transitions, life tasks, and environmental stress. Life-space interviewing and milieu therapy were reexamined in order to diversify helping sites beyond the social agency and the usual host settings, and at the same time utilize these two sites in new ways. The idea of task was considered as a means of engaging people in significant, purposive activity to meliorate their situations.
4. The implications of consumerism, new kinds of work teams, and interdisciplinary roles were considered for the structuring of social services. Anthropological studies in spatial behavior and variations in the experiencing of time, and ideas from environmental psychology on the effects of physical settings contributed a different dimension to considerations of structural arrangements. Organizational theory was mined for the development of procedures to effect institutional change or to tap resources.

Students had an opportunity to engage in laboratory activities that were designed as part of the seminar. These consisted of sharply focused experiences in practice research or in the teaching of practice and were connected to the ecological metaphor.[10] Three of the students chose an experience in teaching casework practice in the master's program: one developed and taught a unit on the life model in work with the dying patient; another developed and taught a unit on the situational approach in practice; and the third developed and taught a unit on the use of social networks as environmental media of helping.

Students who chose a limited segment of research on practice began with observations either in a local child welfare agency that was deeply committed to a life model of practice or in a family agency that offered service to middle-aged persons facing phase-specific tasks around loss, ego depletion, and disengagement. From their examination of practice, the students constructed exploratory research questions. These were related to consumer needs, demographic variables, problem definition, service arrangements, and criteria for identifying an ecological perspective and life model of practice. Time did not permit carrying the effort further, although it appears that interest may have been generated in dissertation research concerning aspects of the ecological orientation in theory and practice.

CONCLUSION

The ecological metaphor appears to be useful in reorganizing knowledge and reconceptualizing practice. It is congenial to social work purpose and value. Hence the teaching experience at the doctoral level appears to be generalizeable to other levels of social work education. I am currently using a modified version of the ecological metaphor in continuing education and in a fourth semester practice elective in the master's program. I believe, however, that it could be introduced in beginning courses at the graduate and undergraduate levels before more limited ways of viewing and handling phenomena acquire a fixed character.

My tentative impressions of the impact on student learning made by the ecological perspective include: (1) the elimination of an hierarchical view of practice in which person and situation have been assumed to require different levels of knowledge and skill, (2) a meaningful organization of knowledge for more effective practice, (3) a reorientation to practice that is closer to human need in today's world, and (4) a development of intellectual interest and rigor in analyzing the historical development of practice, the social purpose of the profession, and the knowledge necessary to achieve this purpose.

The practical and poetical quality of ecological thought, its emphasis on scientific knowledge, and its concern for human aspiration and the fitness of environments parallel the aims of social work practice and education. Reaching toward an ecological metaphor can be an adaptive step in the evolution of a socially oriented profession.

NOTES

1. These dichotomies were expressed in the ideological controversies of indoor versus outdoor relief in the 1880s, and charity versus social justice in the 1890s and beyond. In succeeding decades the dichotomies were expressed in the conflicts of science versus humanism and treatment versus advocacy.
2. William E. Gordon, "Toward a Social Work Frame of Reference," *Journal of Education for Social Work*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Fall 1965); and "Basic Constructs for an Integrative and Generative Conception of Social Work," in *The General Systems Approach: Contributions Toward an Holistic Conception of Social Work*, ed. Gordon A. Hearn (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1969).
3. See for example, Daniel Bell, "The Disjunction of Culture and Social Structure," *Daedalus* (Winter 1965); and Rene Dubos, *The God Within* (New York: Scribner's, 1972).
4. Carol H. Meyer, *Social Work Practice: A Response to the Urban Crisis* (New York: The Free Press, 1970); and Carel B. Germain, "Social Casework," in *Social Welfare 1993: Goals and Perspectives*, ed. Harleigh B. Trecker (New York: Association Press, 1973).
5. Gregory Bateson, *Steps to an Ecology of the Mind* (New York: Ballantine, 1972), p. 1.
6. Rene Dubos, *Man Adapting* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965); Theodosius Dobzhansky, *Mankind Evolving* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962); and Paul Weiss, "The Biological Basis of Adaptation," in *Adaptation*, ed. John Roman (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1950).
7. See for example, Jane von Lawick-Goodall, *In the Shadow of Man* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1971); Harry P. Harlow, "Love in Infant Monkeys," *Scientific American* (June 1959); Konrad Z. Lorenz, *King Solomon's Ring* (New York: Thomas Crowell, 1952); and N. Tinbergen, *Social Behavior in Animals* (London: Methuen, 1953).
8. Hyman J. Weiner, Sheila Akabas, and John J. Sommer, *Mental Health Care in the World of Work* (New York: Association Press, 1973).
9. Joan Shapiro, *Communities of the Alone* (New York: Association Press, 1970).
10. I had intended to provide actual practice experiences for those interested, but this proved difficult to do because of time limitations. With more lead time it should be possible to develop a limited practice segment related to the life model.

Social Work Practice Models: Teaching the Differential Aspects of Practice

by
LOUISE C. JOHNSON

This paper discusses an approach to teaching social work practice that allows for the consideration of many different modes of practice, and allows the student to develop an in-depth understanding of basic practice concepts and of particular models. Currently there is a proliferation of models or approaches to practice. Students are interested in learning about current innovations, yet they also need to learn about the developed and tried approaches. The approach in this paper uses a schema for content analysis that was developed as a learning aid for comparing models of practice.

This approach is used in the second half of a second practice course that is designed to develop understanding about the differential use of common core, to introduce specific classical and current approaches, and to provide the knowledge and tools for selecting approaches to use in specific practice situations.

Discussion of this approach will consist of the conceptualization used as a basis for teaching, teaching-learning considerations, and possible development of the conceptualization.

Louise C. Johnson is director of the Social Work Program at the University of South Dakota.

THE NATURE OF MODELS

The term "model" has become rather popular in social work literature. Often it appears to be a popular term used with little understanding of its meaning. Yet further consideration reveals that it has potential for becoming a powerful organizing vehicle in the development of social work knowledge.

There are three major characteristics of a model. First, it is related to reality. A model should define the nature of its scope or territory. It should also define what aspects within that scope will be considered. Thus the reality is limited to manageable content. Secondly, it consists of concepts and relationships between concepts. The content of the limited reality is expressed through concepts pertinent to the usage projected for the model. One of the contributions of the approach is the consideration of relationships among concepts. Thirdly, it is a disciplined, organized approach to knowledge. The approach, however, has sufficient flexibility to organize knowledge without imprisoning it. New concepts that arise can be included. A range of relationships can be examined and new ones sought.[1]

The term "model" in social work literature apparently was first used by Hearn. He saw the usefulness of the concept in the area of symbolic representation of a perceptual phenomenon.[2] The phenomena dealt with in social work practice are complex and usually are discussed in a case-by-case, descriptive-evaluative manner.

The terms "model," "approach," and "theory" are related. Theory implies a high level of knowledge development. A theory may be developed in such a way that it is also a model. Approach, as used in relation to practice, implies a developing conceptualization. Theories of practice and approaches to practice have the characteristics of a model. Thus "model" has been chosen as the term best describing the organizing construct of this paper.

Various classifications of models, approaches, or theories within the traditional methods of social work have been developed. Roberts and Nee[3] did this for casework, Papell and Rothman[4] for groupwork, Rothman[5] for community organization, and Stein[6] for work with families. Each presented a different schema for classification, but the 15 models represented in these selections are among the most important, most widely used, and most adequately developed in social work practice. The 1971 *Encyclopedia of Social Work* explicitly discusses casework and groupwork, using categories that generally overlap with Roberts and Nee, and Papell and Rothman, though the nomenclature is slightly different. The community and organizational models are also classified implicitly.[7] The development and classification of models related to organizational change and applicable to more than one system are still somewhat limited.

DIFFERENTIATION OF SOCIAL WORK MODELS

There are many dimensions that can be used to differentiate and classify the various models of social work. Each of the classifications referred to above uses a different schema. Three major factors seem to influence the differential use of the common core: (1) the unit of attention, (2) the underlying assumptions, particularly those related to the use of knowledge about human behavior, and (3) the social problem.

Traditionally social work theory had been organized around work with individuals (casework), groups (groupwork), and communities (community organization). More recently, work with families and organizations has been a focus. There is a differential in relation to the nature and size of the social system (unit of attention). The importance of this differential may decrease as models used with several systems are developed – for example, individuals and families in crisis intervention. It will remain important, however, because different systems call for the use of different assumptions and generate different approaches.

Practice theory must be congruent with underlying human behavior assumptions. Currently no one theory of human behavior is accepted by all practitioners, nor is any theory adequate for all situations. Thus many human behavior assumptions are in use. Some of the practice models are a direct outgrowth of a particular human behavior theory, for example, the sociobehavioral model;others grow out of a particular combination of theories, such as the crisis model out of ego psychology and crisis theory.

There do not seem to be any models that are related solely to a particular social problem. Agencies and services are organized around particular tasks that relate to amelioration or control of social problems, and lead to specific functions, roles, and strategies. Thus we find a group of models developed around the clinical, therapy, amelioration of dysfunctioning constellation, or around helping persons cope with problems of social functioning. The choice between these two stances in part relates to how society views the problem.

At the present time more than one classification schema is needed. Some overlapping groups of models are: the clinical; those used for larger system change; those related to social functioning; those based in part on ego psychology but that are eclectic in nature;

those developed as reactions to the psychoanalytic theory; and the traditional casework, groupwork, and community organization models. As the general models (those which are not related to traditional methods) are developed, it will be helpful if they can be classified.

ANALYSIS OF A PRACTICE MODEL

No one model can be used for all practice situations. Workers need to scan possible models for their usefulness in specific practice situations. They also need to move to an in-depth analysis of models they use. A schema has been developed that is helpful for both tasks – it can be used to summarize the salient aspects of several models, and it also contains a framework for in-depth analysis. The schema considers four major areas; source, underlying assumptions, practice theory, and evaluation.

Source

No model can be understood without consideration of why it was developed. Knowledge of the source should include: who conceptualized the model, when, what concern it was a response to, and what the influential precursors of the model were.

Underlying Assumptions

All models are based on certain assumptions. Often these are not explicitly stated, though any serious study of a model requires their identification and specification. There are three groups of assumptions: those related to the knowledge base, those stating the values underlying the model, and those related to assumptions about the function of social work.

The knowledge base primarily concerns the person in the situation or the human behavior theory used with the model. Three kinds of theory are important; personality theory, theory about the nature of interpersonal interaction, and sociological theory that explains the situation. Value assumptions tend to be omitted from the model literature. There seems to be an implicit assumption that models adhere to social work values. Sometimes a philosophical stance is apparent, such as the growth orientation of the functional model. Most models at least implicitly make some assumptions about the nature of social work, or at least about that segment of social work for which the model is useful. These may be related to the function or goals of social work. They also may be derived from the reason the model was developed.

Practice Theory

Social work practice theory tends to be formulated around three major concepts: assessment, process, and intervention. The prime concepts of each model usually can be related to one of these, although emphasis may be placed on more than one. Practice theory has two dimensions: the differentiation within each of the three major concepts, and the prime concepts of the model that determine where the emphasis is placed.

All the models involve assessment. The differentiation is around the information sought and how it is to be used. The psychosocial model looks at etiology and tends to use psychiatric classifications in addition to a psychosocial diagnosis. The sociobehavioral model is primarily interested in current behavior and what triggers it. The various group models place different emphasis on understanding the individual and the group. Most models also specify a process. Some processes are complex, such as the sociobehavioral model, while others are very simple, such as the functional model.

Intervention is the most difficult concept to analyze. It is conceptualized in different ways in the various models and also is sometimes difficult to articulate. Early models tended to emphasize assessment and assumed that an individualized response would result. Examination of four elements for a plan of action (goals, units of attention, tasks, and strategies) gives the needed framework.[8] However, important elements of some models are still not covered adequately. In this schema, relationship and role are considered with task, and technique and principle are grouped with strategy.

It is important to consider the nature of the model's goals, as well as how they are determined, for example, who determines them and in what manner the determination is made.

There may be more than one unit of attention. In the remedial model the individual is the primary unit, but the group is also a unit of attention. It is important to note the primary unit. Some models have several different units, for example, the reciprocal and crisis models.

The task is not only a product of what needs to be done, but of the relationship between worker and client and their roles. Relationship tends to be a primary concept, but the nature of the relationship varies. Client and worker each have an expected role. What needs to be done and who does it arises from role expectations. In some models role relationship and task also need to be considered in regard to significant others.

The entire model might be considered the strategy. However, several models specify strategies of a different order, for example, the confrontation strategy of social action. For other models the specification of the important techniques is appropriate, for example, the various kinds of influence in the remedial model. In the functional model, principle is the formulation used to consider what is done.

Evaluation

Development of skill in evaluating models is essential if workers are to be effective. The choice of model depends on evaluation along several dimensions: innerconsistency, place and usefulness in social work, feasibility, and the strengths and limitations of the model.[9]

There are several perspectives from which to view the innerconsistency of any model. First, one should examine it to see if there are any inconsistencies among various parts: Does the practice theory follow from the human behavior assumptions? Where an eclectic stance is taken regarding human behavior, is it clear how the various theories have been used? Do these theories fit together in some consistent manner? Are the philosophic implications of the human behavior theory and the stated or implicit value assumptions consistent? Is the practice theory consistent with the assumed values and functions of social work? How do the various practice concepts fit together? This kind of evaluation will also indicate existing gaps in the conceptualization.

Second, one should examine the usefulness of the assumptions. Are they relevant to the situation addressed by the model? Are the assumptions clearly stated and formulated so that they can be related easily to the practice theory? A third perspective is to examine the implicit assumptions related to the cause of the problems. Is there a logical relationship between the hypothesis, the method of action planned, and the probable outcomes? Is empirical evidence available about outcomes? If so, what is the nature of this evidence?

Evaluation of fit and usefulness in social work would specify the segment of practice in which the model could be used. It would also specify how congruent the model is with general practice knowledge, values, and skills. In other words, this part of the evaluation would relate the differential aspect of practice to the common core.

Feasibility factors also need to be considered. A model is feasible for a worker's use only if it is congruent with his basic philosophy and way of operating. A worker must have at his disposal resources needed to use the model – time, money, equipment, space, and so on, and he must be qualified to use the model. Client limitations and environmental constraints also affect the use of the model.

Evaluating the model along the above dimensions will make apparent certain strengths and limitations. Delineating these is an important step in choosing the most effective and efficient model in a particular situation.

TEACHING-LEARNING CONSIDERATIONS

No unit of a course stands alone, but should be connected with material taught in earlier units and should lead to other learning experiences. The Models of Social Work Practice unit discussed here is the last one of a two-semester integrated practice sequence. The first practice course presents the common core of social work practice. The second one presents the differential use of the common core. In addition, the practice sequence is dependent on content taught in order in other sequences.

Four major supports for teaching this material are: (1) a social systems framework for teaching in the school, (2) an integrated practice stance, (3) the schema presented in the preceding section, and (4) availability of outlines of models for students to scan.

Hearn's original material using the model conceptualization was concerned with social systems.[10] Lathrope states, "I think pursuit of models is a prerequisite to the professional use of systems ideas."[11] The social systems approach is a model for organizing diverse human behavior understandings. Human behavior taught in a social systems framework is an important support to teaching practice in a models framework because each calls for systemic thinking.

This approach to teaching was developed as a means of presenting the vast array of social work practice knowledge. It provides the linkage between the traditional methods framework and the newer integrated practice approach. This linkage is most evident in the choice of concepts used in the schema as comparative dimensions. Another linkage is developed as students survey the models and consider them as possible interventive strategies.

The schema enables students to place a variety of conceptualizations in a common form. This then allows for comparative study and development of understanding for differential usage of common concepts; it also gives a framework for in-depth study and evaluation of any model in a manner that builds on students' understanding of practice as developed in study of the common core.

The schema has been used to formulate a content analysis of 24 models of practice.[12] These have been developed as brief outlines that note sources, underlying assumptions, practice theory, use in practice, and major references. From these outlines students choose what they want to study in-depth. They also are able to appreciate the salient features of various models without having to read a vast amount of practice literature. –

The unit covers about a half semester and has three facets: (1) presentation of conceptualization and schema, (2) comparative survey of models of practice, and (3) in-depth study of a model of practice. The conceptualization and schema are the content of the first session. Students also have this material available in written form. The material is used for comparison and in-depth study to facilitate further understanding. The remaining class sessions are used for the comparative survey. Several formats have been used for these sessions: student presentations of models they are studying in-depth; focus on one model a week with comparison to similar models; focus on a particular group of models each week;[13] and focus on particular aspects of the schema and a particular group of models. Each student studies in-depth a model of his choice. Papers and oral presentations are used for this. Considerable emphasis is placed on evaluation in this assignment.

This method of teaching has been very useful in helping students integrate previously presented material. They gain an historical perspective on the development of practice as they consider the source of the models. They develop understanding of the need for congruence of the assumptions underlying the model, the practice theory, and their own philosophic stance. They come to appreciate the need to make assumptions explicit and to identify gaps in underlying knowledge. They gain skill in choosing what knowledge and model is appropriate for a specific practice situation. The integration of the use of practice concepts is a primary learning outcome. They also develop considerable evaluative skill.

The course is also important for the learning that takes place in the second year. Students are sensitized to gaps in their knowledge and this helps them identify models of practice they would like to study at another time. The course also sets the framework in which they can develop their personal practice model or models to meet specific needs.

One major problem is how to relate the schema to some of the non-social work approaches to practice. These would include transactional analysis, gestalt therapy, sensitivity groups and other approaches students want to learn about. Because these have not been developed in a social work context, they resist being fit into the schema. Whether this should be done is another question; any use of these approaches must include some integration with social work values and a general social work approach to the helping process.

The method of teaching discussed here has been useful to the instructor in that it has added much to the identification of the common core of social work. It also has pointed out a number of the limitations of our present knowledge base, such as lack of explicit consideration of value assumptions, failure to develop relationships among them when using many concepts, failure to specify what parts of various theories are being used, and lack of well-developed models regarding organizational change.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE MODEL

Experience in using the model has demonstrated its usefulness as a teaching tool and its potential for further development of social work knowledge. Four foci could be pursued: (1) the use of the schema with non-social work approaches as discussed in the previous section, (2) a comparative analysis of models, (3) a search for an adequate means of grouping models, and (4) development of new models of practice.

Any comparative analysis would have to be multidimensional. Content analysis of the various models as presented in the outlines may contain the data needed. Dimensions that should be compared appear to be date of development, human behavior assumptions, model function, primary unit of attention, practice theory concepts emphasized, and the relationship/role of worker construct used. The work of Ford and Urban also should be explored since they seem to be exploring the same problem in the area of models of therapy.[14]

Logical groupings might develop from comparative analysis. Another dimension that might be considered for grouping is philosophical stance. As the value framework is seldom explicit and little work has been done in this area, considerable exploratory study will be needed for its development. Groupings for current practice may become more apparent as new models of practice are developed.

The development or conceptualization of new models would be more directly related to practice. As gaps in practice theory are identified, the schema offers a structure for conceptualizing knowledge gained by practitioners in the realm of "practice wisdom." Organizational change, practice that crosses systems (e.g., uses individual, family organizational change), and social work models based on developing therapies (e.g., Gestalt) are some of the conceptualizations that could be developed.

A major criterion for the usefulness of a teaching approach is the value of the learning experience to the student. Many students have commented that though initially the analysis of a model seemed like just another assignment, they eventually found it to be a valuable experience. Students also felt that the comparative approach in class was very helpful in sensitizing them to many aspects of social work practice. A number of students used the formulation in a variety of ways in subsequent work at the school of social work. It is also hoped that practitioners who are exposed to this framework will realize that there are different choices in the models they use, and that they don't have to use the "fad of the day" to meet all practice needs.

NOTES

1. Development of these ideas is based on a definition in George A. Theodorson and Achilles G. Theodorson, *A Dictionary of Sociology* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1959), p. 261.
2. Gordon Hearn, *Theory Building in Social Work* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958).
3. Robert Roberts and Robert H. Nee, eds., *Theories of Social Casework* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970).
4. Catherine P. Papell and Beulah Rothman, "Social Group Work Models: Possession and Heritage," *Journal of Education for Social Work*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Fall 1966), pp. 66-77.
5. Jack Rothman, "Three Models of Community Organization Practice," *Social Work Practice 1968* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968).
6. Joan Stein, *The Family As a Unit of Study and Treatment* (Seattle: University of Washington School of Social Work, 1969).
7. *Encyclopedia of Social Work*, 16th ed. (New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971).
8. This specification of the elements of a plan of action was developed by the author for use in the practice sequence at the University of Iowa School of Social Work.
9. Helpful discussions of evaluation include: Robert Pruger and Harry Specht, "Assessing Theoretical Models of Community Organization Practice: Alinsky as a Case in Point," *Social Service Review*, Vol. 45 (December 1971), pp. 440-54; Edward J. Mullen, James R. Dumpson, and Associates, *Evaluation of Social Intervention* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972), chapters 1 and 4; and Scott Briar and Henry Miller, *Problems and Issues in Social Casework* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), chapters 3 and 4.
10. Hearn, *op. cit.*
11. Donald Lathrop, "The General Systems Approach in Social Work Practice," in *The General Systems Approach: Contributions Toward an Holistic Conception of Social Work*, ed. Gordon Hearn (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1969), p. 45.
12. These include the models discussed in Roberts and Nee, *op. cit.*, Papell and Rothman, *op. cit.*, Rothman, *op. cit.*, and Stein, *op. cit.* In addition, organizational models that have been included are: administration, consultation, change from within, Rino J. Patti and Herman Resnick, "Changing the Agency from Within," *Social Work*, Vol. 17 (July 1972), pp. 48-57; and program development, author developed. Also included are: the developmental model of working with groups developed by the Boston University School of Social Work; existential, Emanuel Tropp, "Social Groupwork: The Developmental Approach," *Encyclopedia of Social Work*, 16th ed. (New York: National

Association of Social Workers, 1971); rational, Harold D. Werner, *A Rational Approach to Social Casework* (New York: Association Press, 1965); situational, Max Siporin, "Situational Assessment and Intervention," *Social Casework*, Vol. 53 (February 1972), pp. 91-109; and task, William Reid and Laura Epstein, *Task-Centered Casework* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972).

13. Some of the groups considered have been clinical, social functioning, reactions to psychoanalytic, and macrosystems. Also, grouping has been by system focus, individual, family, small group, organization, and community. Historical development has been another organizing method. Each method has value and a combination seems to be most useful.

14. Donald Ford and Hugh Urban, *Systems of Psychotherapy* (New York: Wiley, 1963).

Evaluating Time and Achievement in a Social Work Practicum

by

JOHN KORBELIK and LAURA EPSTEIN

Studies of the allocation of time in the practicum are being made at the University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration. Data has been obtained from a larger evaluation study of the Task-centered Treatment Project, a first-year, three-quarter course, with an enrollment of 20-25 students each year.[1] Trying to strike an appropriate balance between class-field and research is an old issue.[2] This report concerns an attempt to realign these two sectors.

The Task-Centered Project combines methods theory, field work practice, and research. It views the field as a laboratory and emphasizes a prescribed set of practice skills simultaneously in all three sectors. The essential skills are named, defined, and classified. Performance evaluations concentrate on the attainment of a specific profile of skills.[3]

At the start of this course five years ago the traditional requirement of 15 hours a week in the field agency was removed. Some tentative guidelines for scheduling the practicum were established:

1. Field hours were arranged with individual students, subject to faculty approval.
2. Students could make a field schedule to fit their class schedule and agency convenience.
3. A maximum number of field hours, no more than 10-12 a

John Korbelik is a research assistant and Laura Epstein is an associate professor, both at the University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration.

week on the average, was established but no minimum was set.
4. Field attendance could be on any day of the week, at hours when experiences congruent with the course curriculum were available at the agency.
5. A quota of four cases at any one time was set.

This plan allowed students to allocate their time to the practicum on the basis of their needs.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Data on student production and achievement in the practicum have been gathered continuously, although the nature, quantity and quality of the data collected from year to year have been influenced by changing needs for information at various times. Most of the information was obtained to make decisions about the learning needs of individual students and to assess the efficiency of practicum sites and student achievement.

Data was gathered from the following sources:

1. Student reports on the allocation of time to the practicum for representative sampled weeks (Year 1 – first and second quarters; Year 2 – none; Year 3 – all three quarters).
2. Monthly production reports for each student giving the number of interviews with individuals, families, and small groups, collateral contacts, and adjunctive learning experiences (Year 1 – none; Years 2 and 3 – all three quarters).
3. Periodic case summaries using a semistructured recording instrument and audiotapes on selected cases (Years 1, 2, and 3 – semistructured instrument; Years 2 and 3 – tapes and written recordings).
4. Evaluation of student performance based on achievement of defined, course-specific, skill objectives (Year 1 – none; Years 2 and 3 – all students).
5. Student evaluations of the course in terms of their feelings of satisfaction upon completion (all three years).

This paper summarizes some of our findings and interpretation of what we have learned about the use of time and levels of production in the practicum, and also about the relationship of time and production to achievement in the course.

TIME USE AND PRODUCTION IN THE PRACTICUM

When strict time requirements were removed we wished to see how much time students would devote to fieldwork. The time samples for Years 1 and 3 showed that students averaged less time in the field than the traditional 15 hours a week. Year 1 students spent an average of 9.5 hours in the practicum in the week of the first-quarter time sample, and 13 hours in the week of the second-quarter. Their average time in the practicum during the two sampled weeks was about 10.5 hours per week. The students in Year 3 averaged 8 hours in the first-quarter sampled week, 11 hours in the second quarter, and 12 hours in the third quarter – an average of about 10.5 hours a week.

For both these years we attempted to account for the amount of time spent in direct client contact contrasted with time spent in other practicum activities (i.e., conferences and meetings, writing case reports, waiting for clients to be assigned and to arrive, etc.). Students in both groups averaged about 2.5 hours a week in direct client contact. In each group, time spent with clients increased in the later quarters. Both groups spent on the average somewhat more time in client contact but less total time in the practicum than casework students studied by Schubert and reported in 1963.[4] This is a weak comparison in view of the time differential, the differences in the educational approaches used, and the content of the courses. There is, however, no other published data we could find that reported time with clients and other time expenditures in the field. We found that on the average the floating time arrangement in the task-centered practicum reduced total time expended. It did not detract from, and possibly increased, the amount of time in direct contact with clients.

Although time allocations were not studied in the second year of the program, monthly production inventories were completed by the students in that year and the following year. Year 2 students averaged 51 interviews per student for the three quarters, and Year 3 students averaged 52.5 interviews. These figures have little meaning in themselves, however, they do indicate opportunities for drill and repetition of the skills stressed in this course. When the consistency between Years 2 and 3 in the numbers of interviews is considered with the consistency between Years 1 and 3 in the amount of practicum time used, a norm for production and time use can be inferred: 10.5 hours a week and 50 interviews a student over three quarters.

Our initial analysis of the data for these three years revealed that individual students varied substantially from the mean, both in the utilization of practicum time and in the number of interviews conducted. Many students exceeded expectations in the amount of time spent in direct client contact, while some students' performance was poor in both quantity and time. Number of interviews and time spent in the practicum were not consistently related.

Two questions emerged: What factors influenced the students in time use and production levels in the practicum? What is the relationship between the time and production variables and achievement in the course?

VARIATIONS IN TIME USE AND PRODUCTION

Four major variables may be considered to affect every educational endeavor – instructor, milieu, student, and subject matter.[5] Instructor variables were not considered in this study since they were constants for all students and were, for all intents and purposes, unalterable.

Milieu Variables

The milieu variable that seemed to have the greatest effect upon time use and levels of production was the rigidity of the organizational structure of the field agency. Elements such as the degree of student autonomy allowed, the quantity of required reports and clearances, and the availability of manuals and resident supervisors were considered in determining whether an agency had a strict or loose organizational structure.

After the first year there seemed to be a strong indication that organizational structure was influencing the variations among students in time use and production. Further exploration of two groups of students clarified this relationship. Students placed in agencies with a strict social work hierarchical organization tended to be high-time users and only moderate to low producers of direct client interviews. Students placed in relatively unstructured settings were on the whole the highest interview producers while only average time users. For example, Year 3 students in a setting without a formal social work structure – a public elementary school – averaged 55 interviews over three quarters but spent an average of only 9.39 hours a week in the practicum. Students in the most highly structured setting – a psychiatric social work unit of a private hospital – averaged less than 30 interviews while spending an average of 12 hours a week in the practicum. The unstructured settings were more efficient in providing direct client contact for students.

The structured settings exerted pressures on students to attend a variety of agency staff meetings and in-service training sessions in order to obtain supervisory sanctions. It seemed that the more structured agencies were exerting a counterinfluence to the course. They were allocating student time for rehearsals for agency employment instead of offering the necessary laboratory experiences.

As a result of this, the practicum plan for Year 4 (1973-1974) excluded agencies of the highly structured type. To date this effort seems to have succeeded in markedly diminishing the student's involvement in tasks not specifically called for by the course curriculum. Early Year 4 data indicated that students spent little time during the first quarter attending agency conferences or staffings. They averaged a few more interviews per student over the first quarter of Year 3, with the latter averaging 16 interviews and the former 19 interviews. Time samples revealed that the number of hours a week spent in the practicum in the first quarter remained fairly constant from Year 3 to Year 4, about 9 hours.[6]

Student Variables

Individual characteristics of students clearly played a part in creating the variation between high and low time users and high and low producers, regardless of milieu influences. By controlling an important milieu variable, organizational structure, production was increased and hours reduced. Yet sizeable variations in production levels and time use among students remained. These differences seem to be related to basic abilities, to the amount of previous social work experience, to interest in the course of study, and to preference for either a conceptual or an action framework. The study of these student variables comprised the major addition to the data collection and evaluation process for Year 4 and will be reported upon at a later date.

Subject Matter

Subject matter may be studied by examining the degree of class and field congruence – the coordination of case assignments in the field with the timing and content of teaching-learning units in the methods and research seminar. In the first three years continual difficulties were encountered in achieving the desired degree of class and field congruence. Cases and groups were being assigned or assumed in the field in a helter-skelter manner, and were not synchronized with the class content. To reduce this dissonance, class and field content was reorganized. In the fourth year the first quarter in class and field was devoted solely to the study, practice, and research of task-centered casework with individuals and families. In the second quarter task-centered groups were added. There followed a series of units of "drill and repetition with a difference," dealing with knowledge contained in other models, such as problem-solving, family treatment, the psychosocial approach, and behavior modification. The making of a class-field connection has been considered by some writers as the ultimate goal for social work education.[7]

TIME USE, PRODUCTION LEVELS, AND ACHIEVEMENT

The critical step in the development of the course curriculum was made during the third year when practice skill objectives were refined sufficiently to be used in the evaluation of student learning: formatively, to gauge the progress of student learning during the academic year, and summatively, to evaluate the students' final achievement in the course.

The profile of practice skills contains 21 course objectives defined in behavioral terms. Each item entails a series of behaviors. Students are continually evaluated in their practicum performance in terms of these objectives. The basic data used for making judgments in the evaluation process come from written case summaries and selected tape recordings of treatment interviews. When cases are discussed in the supervision group sessions, or case summaries or recorded tapes commented on, the practice skill objectives are addressed.

For the purposes of this discussion, evaluations of the students at the end of the third quarter were the data for the criterion of achievement. The criterion was defined as achievement of the course objectives as outlined in the profile of practice skills. Ratings were made by the methods-field faculty member on the basis of consistency in exhibiting the behaviors prescribed, as reflected in the student's written case summaries and taped interviews. Each objective was rated on a five-point scale, and a summative rating focused on final practice skill attainment. These ratings were used to determine course grades. The ratings provided a moderately accurate assessment of achievement.

In determining student achievement levels for this study a stringent criterion was adopted. Students were divided into two groups: the criterion mastery group – those who had achieved a high level and mastered the course objectives; and the nonmastery group – all others. The criterion mastery group contained only those students who attained ratings of "consistent and comprehensive" or "usually good and steady" on most (85 percent) of the practice skill objectives of the course. The other students passed the course and mastered many of the course objectives, and were rated as performing in a manner considered "incomplete or uneven" (or worse) on more than 15 percent of the course objectives.

Given this definition of achievement, how were time use and production levels associated with criterion mastery? Nineteen students from Year 3 completed the course. Twelve received ratings on their final course evaluation at a level sufficiently high to be included in the criterion mastery group. The remaining 7 nonmastery students passed the course but were only moderate achievers as rated on the practice skill objectives. The students in the criterion mastery group were, on the average, the highest users of practicum time as well as the highest producers of client interviews. They averaged 11.81 hours a week practicum time over the three-quarter time samples, while the nonmastery group averaged 9.24 hours a week (class mean: 10.5 hours). In terms of total number of interviews the pattern was the same: the criterion mastery group averaged 59.45 interviews while the nonmastery group averaged 29.33 interviews (class mean: 51).

The students who spent more time in the practicum than the class mean, and who conducted more treatment interviews than the class mean, were judged as having mastered the objectives of the course. Thus both more time in the practicum and more production were generally equated with high levels of achievement. Conversely, both less time and less production were equated with moderate levels of achievement.

The mean time expenditure for the criterion mastery group (11.81 hours) was lower than the traditional 15 hours a week. Perhaps time is an artifact of the more important variable, number of interviews.

The students in this course were allowed to determine the amount of time they spent on the learning tasks in the practicum. For the criterion mastery group we know that this was at least as much as they needed. We do not know how much time the nonmastery group would need to master the objectives of the course, but we do know that under the floating time arrangement they did not choose to spend enough time to achieve a mastery level.[8]

Since we view time as probably an artifact of production levels, we should consider how many client interviews a student needs in order to attain mastery of the skill objectives. Anderson made the distinction between "time on task" (time spent actively engaged in a learning activity) and total time spent in a learning environment. He demonstrated that the degree of learning was more accurately a function of the ratio of amount of time spent on task/time needed to learn. The better learners were the more efficient learners.[9]

Our data suggest that total time in the practicum was a factor in student achievement when it was used primarily for direct client interviews, and when the interviews occurred in order to practice a behaviorally defined set of practice skills. Time spent in the learning environment (the field agency) on activities that may be termed socialization for professional behavior did not seem to be an important factor in acquiring the skills designated in this course as achievement criteria.

There is research evidence that when learning tasks are sequential, mastery of skills from the early units are prerequisites for and predictors of mastery of skills in later units. If the opportunities for learning the early skills are not present or are not taken advantage of, learning skills in later units will be delayed or made impossible.[10] Accordingly, if students in this social treatment practicum do not have sufficient learning opportunities early, they can be expected to have difficulty in achieving mastery of the skill objectives at the end of the third quarter. It may be possible to evolve strategies to identify and assist nonmastery students early in the practicum. The study reported here indicates the appropriateness of concentrating on high numbers of direct client interviews. Planned studies of class and field congruence and of the cognitive set and affective characteristics of students may provide further empirical bases for developing instructional strategies.

NOTES

1. Laura Epstein and William J. Reid, "The Coordinated Social Treatment Project" (Paper presented at the 19th Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, San Francisco, February 1972).
2. Edith Abbott, *Social Welfare and Professional Education* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931). Also, Jack Rothman and Wyatt C. Jones, *A New Look at Field Instruction* (New York: Association Press, 1971).
3. "Profile of Practice Skills: Treatment Performance Items," mimeographed, Curriculum document, SSA 304/5, Task-Centered Treatment – Families, Individuals, Groups (Chicago: University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration, n.d.).
4. Margaret Schubert, *Field Instruction in Social Casework: A Report of an Experiment* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963).
5. Laurence Siegel and Lila Siegel, "The Instructional Gestalt," in *Instruction: Some Contemporary Viewpoints,* ed. Laurence Siegel (San Francisco: Chandler, 1967). Also, Ian Westbury, "Curriculum Evaluation," *Review of Educational Research,* Vol. 40, No. 2 (1970).
6. Year 4 data has been collected at this writing but is not yet completely analyzed.
7. Louis Lowy, Leonard Bloksberg, and Herbert Walberg, *Integrative Learning and Teaching in Schools of Social Work* (New York: Association Press, 1971), p. 82.
8. For discussion of connections between variations in student ability, motivation, and experience, see John E. Carroll, "A Model of School Learning," *Teacher's College Record,* Vol. 64 (1963), pp. 723-33; and Benjamin S.

Bloom, "Learning for Mastery," *CEISP Evaluation Comment* (Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles Press, 1968).

9. Lorin Anderson, "Time and School Learning" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1973).

10. R. M. Gagne and N. Paradise, "Abilities and Learning Sets in Knowledge Acquisition," *Psychological Monographs*, Vol. 75 (1961).

Human Functioning as an Interpersonal Whole: The Dimensions of Affect, Behavior, and Cognition

by
HENRY W. MAIER

PRELUDE

The other day as I was pruning our garden's prize apple tree several neighbors offered comments: "Henry, be sure you saw away *above* each branch intersection!" "You're doing fine! Keep at it with even strokes." "Henry, don't mind all our talk. You're all right!" "Save the main branches, prune the suckers."

Who among my neighbors were the real helpers to me? Unwittingly, in telling me what to know, what to do, and how to feel my neighbors responded to me collectively as a whole person, but each neighbor addressed himself to some aspect of my being – to *doing* things in a certain way, to *knowing* and thus thinking more clearly about the art of pruning, and to *feeling* more at ease about myself as I worked.

What did these comments mean to me? Naturally I liked the personal attention, but several of my neighbors were also wasting a lot of wind for all the good it did me. One neighbor's advice was welcome. He had become aware of my dearth of pruning knowledge and had specific usable directions for me. This neighbor not only meant well; he did well.[1]

Henry W. Maier is a professor at the University of Washington School of Social Work.

What has my neighborly encounter to do with social work practice? A neighborly get-together is – as is a social work get-together – between people with the interpersonal aspect of the experience at the forefront. The social work get-together, moreover, rests upon the tacit or contractual understanding that the social worker is there to make a difference in helping people knowingly and predictively. The goal of a professional helping encounter is to expand the persons' capacities to deal more effectively with their particular life situations. A social worker does not change his clients. Rather he tries to create conditions that predictively enable those individuals to develop their capacity for changing their life situation. This stance is applicable whether the worker focuses upon an entire series of interactions or whether he applies this premise to a single moment of social work practice.

INTRODUCTION

Social work practice has rested upon the assumption that each person interacts with another as a whole person. Yet the utility of this truism is questionable unless the parts of that whole person can be understood systematically so that observations and interventions achieve some precision. My thesis is analogous to the continuously emerging knowledge of cardiac, digestive, or neurological systems that increasingly permits more specific intervention and treatment of a given subsystem without violating the sytem-as-a-whole.[2]

On the subsequent pages I will present a conceptual analysis of human functioning as a whole and its three subsystems: cognition, affect, and behavior. My analysis builds upon the following propositions:

1. A conceptual distinction can be made between different dimensions of human functioning. Each of these dimensions can be analyzed and predictively manipulated while preserving the assumption of the person as an interacting whole.
2. In the practice of social work the dimensions of cognitive, affective, and behavioral functions are particularly relevant for the intervening actions that come within the province of interpersonal social work practice.[3]
3. Each of these three dimensions of functioning has its own developmental continuum and apparent special modes of operation.
4. Each specific dimension requires a different repertoire of knowledge and skills for intervening effectively in furthering the individual's total functioning.

COGNITIVE FUNCTIONING

Cognitive functioning is rooted in the development and patterning of thinking processes. The dimension of cognition contains the processes of perceiving, reasoning, understanding, comprehending, and also the use of language. Some might argue that these processes alone provide the major thrust to human functioning because a person's understanding of a situation determines his actions.[4] In spite of the fact that cognitive processes influence personal transactions, the role of cognition is in no way synonymous with doing or feeling.

Findings on congitive processes provide us with a frame of reference for the study and manipulation of cognitive functions.[5] It should be emphasized that these findings are consistent with data on other dimensions of human functioning.[6] To illustrate, Piaget's observations on the development of object perception parallels formulations on the forming of affect relationships.[7] Yet in the cognitive dimension a person deals with different aspects of this human process. Early in life the young child deals with the image (notion) of predictable constancy of an object out of sight while affective permanency of an object out of sight brings the affect experience of predictable reliability of depending upon others (i.e., developing a sense of trust). Such knowledge applied to practice suggests that the infant as well as every person in a new situation judges the continuance of the existence of objects by their visibility. A person developmentally or situationally at the beginning has to see to believe. If a social worker goes on vacation shortly after starting with a new client, the client will not perceive the social worker as simply a worker going on vacation, but will feel a sense of loss. The old folk-wisdom "seeing is believing" is valid after all.

Most important is the fact that cognitive functions follow a developmental continuum with lawful consequences. For instance, Piaget's research establishes that reasoning in its earlier forms is anchored in the observations of events juxtaposed with the end results obtained. As the developmental continuum unfolds a person reasons by relating two and eventually several variables. Only with more advanced development in reasoning power can a person comprehend the variability of a life situation. These cognitive progressions precede comprehension of the notions of relativity and equity and the concomitant emergence of a capacity to think by hypotheses. Only on the latter level can a person comprehend and employ analogies as well as compare several propositions simultaneously with each other.

In practice this means the worker would do well to assess a person's level and patterns of thinking in order to communicate with him at his level. Visualize a person who is struggling with the process of comprehending what is happening in his life, as opposed to a person struggling with managing his life (a behavioral matter) or feeling thwarted in life (an affect factor). The worker is challenged to assess that person's level and pattern of thinking and determine what steps will be necessary for him to move beyond his present comprehension. Should the worker assist the person with the accounting of his day to help him understand what is going on? Should he assist with the ordering of the events of the day to help the person find the key variables? Or can the worker search with the person for several alternatives in order to reflect jointly on the various alternatives before him? The worker must determine the level on which to think with the other person and how to share information most cogently with him.

Cognitive processes take precedence whenever an aspect of perception, labeling, reasoning, understanding, and comprehension is in question. However, cognitive processes are always at issue whenever information-sharing takes place. It is not only a question of hearing or accepting a message but a matter of comprehending it which implies being capable of using it cognitively. Consequently, communication in the form and on the level the other person can understand, comprehend, and integrate becomes the central issue.

The hypothesis on the cognitive dimension is: if the worker creates conditions which will predictively assist the other person to *comprehend* a factor more fully, then the person can perform more competently in connection with the factor and feel better about it.

AFFECT (OR EMOTIONAL) FUNCTIONING

Emotional functioning is intimately connected with the development of affect (feeling) states and their impact upon a person's behavior.[8] These emotional processes have a material identity in physiological function in the endocrine system. In another way emotional processes can be explained heuristically using the theoretical constructs of emotional development and operations. The latter may serve as our present knowledge foundation until the empirical differentiations and relations between physiological and psychological processes have been established more systematically.

Emotional functioning is descriptively equated with feelings – the sensations associated with feelings, the experiences of valuing one's self and linking as well as separating that self differentially from other persons, things, and experiences. Emotional functioning incorporates affective processes – from reaching out (trusting immediate ongoing experiences) to relating to a minute part in one's own full cycle of history.[9] It includes the processes of locating and repeating satisfaction, experiencing the continuation of satisfaction with the same person(s), boundary delineation, selective modeling, and finally various modes of identification.[10]

Each one of these processes adds to the general process of self-realization, attitude formation, and other qualities of interpersonal relations. Envision a developmental continuum that moves from requiring predictable personal satisfaction[11] from one person, to several key persons, to dependable groups of persons within a definable social context, and possibly eventually to feeling at one with one's total life experience. This continuum provides a frame of reference for finding direction and relevant responses to people on the basis of their affect state of functioning.[12] Fomulations, as theoretical constructs, as descriptive accounts, or as an assortment of empirical findings form the base for dealing with affect as a theoretical entity, closely intertwined with though distinctly different from other dimensions of human functioning.[13]

A different problem exists for the worker as he studies affect. He must decide which formulation to choose amidst the large array of choices. In spite of all the apparent choices, the actual selection becomes more limited if one once has to make a decision between closed and open system formulations[14] and between homeostatic and heterostatic assumptions.[15] To illustrate, the major decision between choosing the theories of Freud, Jung, Hartmann, and Anna Freud, and those of Erikson, White, or others is not a choice between the old and the new apostles, but rather a decision between closed or open, homeostatic or heterostatic formulations. In actual practice it results in either relying upon processes of transference and interpretation or close interpersonal encounters.

I find White's stress upon the experience of competence as a measure of affect a useful conceptual link between the behavioral aspect of effectiveness and the introspective aspect of feelings about one's effectiveness.[16] For White, a person gains effectiveness through his experiences of impact upon others. In other words, what is crucial is not the behavior he delivers but the affectual impact the totality of the experience has for the person. If we were to return to the previously projected helping situation in which a person was puzzled by his life situation, the worker would not only have to determine how the person perceived his life, but also what he felt about his ongoing life situation. The latter ongoing assessment would provide a direction on how to respond to the individual affectively. For example, which way of responding will convey the support that will further the development of the particular person? In the classroom similar conceptual strategy decisions have to be made. If a teacher senses uneasiness in the classroom and defines the issues as essentially an affect matter, he is apt to change his affect relationship to the class through individual conferences, general discussion, or trying to relate differently to the class in order to bring class and teacher closer together.

In selecting interventive techniques while working with the affect dimensions the worker selects the means that are consistent with his chosen frame of reference on affect development. Each of the conceptual perspectives on emotional functioning yields different repertoires of technique. If the worker were to deal with the emotional dilemma of interpersonal closeness within an analytic frame of reference, techniques associated with freeing dammed-up and distorted feelings would be central to the worker's efforts. He is apt to turn either to techniques fostering greater self-awareness and insight and the teachings of the leading practitioners with such a perspective (Ackerman and Bion), or those stressing an expression of inner states of feelings (notably, Axline and Perls).[17] In contrast, a reliance upon ego psychology concepts produces techniques rooted in interpersonal experiences – from transactional interchange to intimate personal encounter, from going in or out of a door together to mutual engagement in deliberations on immediate ongoing experiences, joint involvement in mini-life experiences, play, work, and leisure.

For the latter of reference a repertoire of techniques can be located in the recent work of Rogers, Schutz, and the sensitivity-encounter efforts dealing with affect factors.[18] The worker's verbal or action techniques focus upon the emotional dimension of the experience, because within this dimension the emotion-laden, affective climate of the relationship rather than the rational understanding of the problem most successfully enables the person's ability to change.

Basic to the affective dimension is the hypothesis: If the worker creates conditions which will predictively assist the other person to *feel* more competent about a particular aspect of his life, then the person can understand and manage more effectively the situation at hand.

BEHAVIORAL FUNCTIONING

Behavioral functioning is anchored in motor activities, bodily management, and social self-management. The concept of behavioral functioning covers that wide range of socialization associated with the development of doing and adaptive variations in doing. It entails both skills development and the social mastery of skills. In social work practice, behavioral functioning can best be headlined as behavioral management in space, time, and social context. Again the question can be raised: Isn't behavior the essence of all interpersonal interactions? Behavior is undoubtedly the most openly and readily researchable interpersonal human experience, although what a person actually does is also influenced by his conception of and feeling about the doing. Yet, the doing itself has its own developmental history and modes of operation. Descriptively, the two-sided coin of human interaction – affect and cognition – has to be shaped into a three-sided one so that behavioral aspects can stand as the third dimension of human functioning.

Studies of behavior, from the onset of gross motor movements to coordinated and socially conditioned behavior including language development, present us with data on developmental progressions and modes of behavior that are interlocked but differentiated from the previously cited dimensions.[19] These studies, primarily empirically established, provide understanding about the development, operation, and manipulation of behavior. To illustrate, behavioral acquisitions occur through learning continuous units of behavior. Consequently behavioral training of others also has to occur by breaking down the desired social behavior into manageable learning units. The creation of such controllable, indigenous behavior units becomes one of the major requirements for potentially effective outcome.

Most importantly, social behavior is acquired through conditioning in one form or another that provides practice within a social context. In other words, a person has to practice, receive feedback (or shaping), and apply the behavior intermittantly to increase the probability of acquiring the behavior. Such a perception encourages us to conceive of a social work session as a practice arena – an area in which conditions are created for behavioral practice so that behavioral acquisitions can occur.[20]

In practice the social worker has to rely upon the knowledge of skill development – be it muscular, language, self-management, social, or specialized occupational skills. Most of behavioral development converges with socialization – a tying together of motor development, personal self-management, and social expectations. Behavior modification as an interventive mode for creating conditions for behavioral changes provides appropriate techniques when behavioral alterations are in the forefront.[21]

In interpersonal intervention the person in search of help is not necessarily at a loss because he feels conflicted or doesn't know of other alternatives. The person is just as apt to be unable to do (to behave or manage) differently. To learn to do differently can only be accomplished through doing and practice in the doing. To illustrate, the capacity to gain another person's attention for joint involvement requires practice and experience in effective attention-getting behavior.[22] The social work encounter then becomes a practice arena for social learning in the desired behavioral acquisitions.

The acquisition of social action skills, as far as they involve behavioral self-management, communication, and group management skills, may also fall within the province of behavioral development. Behavior is to be practiced and acquired in order to enhance the capacity of the person to manipulate with greater predictability the social environment.

In the classroom the same developmental requirements exist whenever students or teachers deal with behavioral acquisitions, in that each learning expectation demands clarity and practice in the doing.

Consequently, doing as a controlled behavioral experience remains the basic vehicle for learning how to do. The following hypothesis then applies: If the worker creates conditions which will predictively assist the other person to *manage* (to behave) a situation more effectively, then the person can comprehend it better and feel more at ease about it.

THE THREE DIMENSIONS IN PRACTICE

I have been exploring a theoretical orientation that can help overcome two major practice tendencies. One tendency is to build upon a single formulation of human functioning – to conceive of and deal with people as if human beings were basically all emotion, all responsive behavior, or essentially rational beings like computers in want of input. The other tendency is to apply knowledge and techniques indiscriminately from one dimension of human functioning to another, confusing interrelatedness of dimensions with interchangeability.

It is my contention that in practice, be it social work intervention or teaching, the social worker has to decide what dimension (subsystem) he is dealing with at any one point. For example listening is a recurrent moot point in practice. Listening in relation to affect issues requires the conveyance of being with the person – listening in such a way that the person is made fully aware of the worker's undivided attention (e.g., head nodding, open mouth, possible responding to pauses, listening with alert body posture, etc.). While listening in the context of cognitive issues the worker is asked to convey his availability for input when needed. This involves a temporary fading out with a body posture conveying a readiness to come in when necessary (sitting relaxed, listening and thinking with the person, commenting on content, etc.). The listening serves to get the worker out of the person's way so that he can think. In helping a person with behavioral acquisitions, listening actually conveys either the observation of behavioral responses or the withholding of reinforcement. Thus the decision is whether to bide one's time for appropriate reinforcement, to free the other person's thinking capacities, or to convey one's personal interest in the other person's experience.

Role playing is being applied more frequently as a viable social work interventive tool. Yet role playing is only a collective term for a wide range of specific interventive techniques. More explicitly, role playing as a technique for assistance with behavioral training requires a simulation of genuine life situations so that the learner can practice the behaviors to be mastered. Practice of behavior, repetition of practice, and intermittant feedback are the focal points of role playing exercised for behavioral acquisition. The model ideal might be ballet practice where training in skill development is important.

In contrast, if affect issues are at stake the efforts are directed toward emotional expressions while behavioral manifestations are secondary. Role-playing structure serves as a point of departure. Roles can be reversed, interchanged, and altered while role playing continues. Departure from the script and normative interactions are fostered. A genuine Halloween party is the ideal model. To act as one feels – to trick or to treat as one fancies, and to have the facility to switch roles interchangeably for one's response to the occasion is the object of role playing for this dimension.

Role playing with a cognitive emphasis demands special attention to timing – interspersing the role-playing experience with review and reflection. The accent shifts from participation (involvement) to participant-observation (involvement with ongoing review). Role playing then becomes an alteration of "play" and "cut." Role assumption and role reversal are chosen for observational input rather than for stimulation and reactive behavior. Role playing aimed at enhancing cognitive processes, including focusing on informational input, has its ideal model in the coffee house where each idea or comment is "chewed over" for its proper fit.

Finally, to be supportive is a common social work aspiration. If support is intended to create conditions that will help the person accomplish specified tasks, then behavioral management and skill performances are of primary interest. The worker is challenged to use techniques that foster behavioral competence. If support is aimed at creating an experience of closeness and joint personal involvement in order to overcome a sense of isolation or social distance, then the worker will introduce interactions intended to assure the person that the worker and other key persons are with him. On other occasions support may involve mapping out with the other person what needs to be done. In these instances the worker's task orientation (cognitive clarity) with a minimum of maintenance support (affect support) and training efforts (behavioral shaping) will help achieve the desired results.

Thus the issue is that the dimension to be dealt with defines the theoretical backdrop and techniques to be used. We tend to do very well in our everyday life. We express love, not by prearranged signs, but by packing feelings into our actions. We test a pie not by checking *into the pie maker's spontaneity but by biting into the pie.* And in studying a treatise like the one at hand we don't review it on the basis of the writer's intentions or on the quality of the printing process, but by scrutinizing it for its content. Why not the same in social work practice?

NOTES

1. This neighbor's comment: "Save the main branches, prune the suckers" specified objects I could recognize and organize. The dichotomous opposites of Western movies, "Get the bad guys, save the good ones" is the language of action where thinking for action must be finally this or that, yes or no.
2. In biological research, living organisms are increasingly studied as a system of interrelated parts functioning as a system-as-a-whole. Here the assumption is that change in one part of the system affects the operations of all parts of the system. What follows logically, then, is the complementary assumption that a change in the system-as-a-whole involves the probability of changes in all subsystems. Though basic modes of operation apply equally to the system-as-a-whole and its subsystem, each subsystem has its own constellations of specific modes of operations that can be verified. See Joseph H. Monane, *A Sociology of Human Systems* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967).
3. Physiological functions are not included though most likely they will move into the social work repertoire of knowledge and work sphere as such knowledge lends itself to ready accessibility to interventive practice (i.e., use of drugs, relating physiological know-how to nutrition, exercises, and other controls.)
4. See Albert Ellis, *Reason and Emotions in Psychotherapy* (New York: Lyle Stuart, 1962); and Virginia Satir, *Conjoint Family Therapy*, 2nd ed. (Palo Alto, Calif.: Science and Behavior Books, 1968).
5. See Henry W. Maier, *Three Theories of Child Development*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), pp. 81-157; and Jean Piaget and Barbel Inhelder, *The Psychology of the Child* (New York: Basic Books, 1969). In addition, research on Head Start programs furnishes added understanding of the effectiveness and failures of various teaching modalities and techniques aimed at cognitive acquisitions. See Robert D. Hess and Virginia Shipman, "Early Blocks to Children's Learning," *Children*, Vol. 12, No. 5 (September-October 1965), pp. 189-94. Also see accounts on transmission of information as a cognitive dimension of helping: W. J. Reid and B. L. Shapiro, "Clients' Reactions to Advice," *Social Service Review*, Vol. 43, (1969), pp. 165-73; and Robert Sunley, "New Dimensions in Reaching Out Casework," *Social Work*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (April 1968), pp. 64-74. On the

Guided Group Interaction approach for techniques of focusing, reasoning, and rational problem solving see Charles Larsen, *Guided Group Interaction: Theory and Method* (Minneapolis: Department of Court Services, Hennepin County, 1970).

6. Maier, *op. cit.*, pp. 198-228.
7. "Object relationship" in psychoanalytic terms; "processes of identification" within an ego psychological interaction formulation. See Urie Bronfenbrenner, "Freudian Theories of Identification and Their Derivatives," *Child Development*, Vol. 31, No. 1 (March 1969), pp. 15-40; and Maier, *op. cit.*, p. 116.
8. "Affect" and "emotional" are used interchangeably.
9. Based upon Erik H. Erikson's and Robert W. White's developmental theory on the emergence of and change in object relationship. See Erik H. Erikson, "Growth and Crises of the Healthy Personality," in *Identity and the Life Cycle: Selected Papers*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Psychological Issues (New York: International Universities Press, 1960), pp. 50-100; Maier, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-79; Robert W. White, "Competence of the Psychosexual States of Development," in *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, ed. M. Jones (Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1960), pp. 97-140; and Robert W. White, *The Enterprise of Living* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1972).
10. Bronfenbrenner, *op. cit.*
11. Note that "predictable personal satisfaction" signifies reliability; in contrast, cognitively the emphasis is on predictable predictability (validity).
12. Again, the foregoing assertion can be challenged by the observation that these factors describe in themselves the whole of a person. The way a person feels about others is the way such an individual will relate to others. Yet the interpersonal relationships are as much influenced by peoples' conceptions of each other as by their affect for each other.
13. See Bernard Berelson and Gary A. Steiner, *Human Behavior* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1964); Allen E. Bergin and Sol L. Garfield, eds., *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971); and Robert R. Sears, *Survey of Objective Studies of Psychoanalytic Concepts* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1951).
14. Henry W. Maier, "Application of Psychological and Sociological Theory to Teaching Social Work with Groups," *Journal of Education for Social Work*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Spring 1967), pp. 29-40.
15. Henry W. Maier, "A Sidewards Look at Change," *Social Service Review*, Vol. 45, No. 2 (June 1971), pp. 123-36.
16. White, "Psychosexual States," *op. cit.*; and *Enterprise of Living*, *op. cit.*
17. "Self-awareness" and "insight" are related to affect development, while a clearer perception of self and self-understanding is primarily dependent upon cognitive processes and is within the realm of cognition.
18. Carl Rogers and Barry Stevens, *Person to Person* (Moab, Utah: Real People Press, 1967); William C. Schutz, *Joy – Expanding Human Awareness* (New York: Grove Press, 1967); Gerard Egan, *Encounter: Group Processes for Interpersonal Growth* (Belmont, Calif.: Brooks-Cole, 1971); and Edgar H. Schein and Warren G. Bennis, *Personal and Organizational Change Through Group Methods: The Laboratory Approach* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965), pp. 1-54.
19. Boyd R. McCandles, *Children: Behavior and Development* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967), pp. 375-414; and Norman L. Munn, *The*

Evolution and Growth of Human Behavior, 2nd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), pp. 336-65.

20. Maier, "A Sidewards Look," *op. cit.*, pp. 131-32.
21. Sidney W. Bijou and Donald M. Baer, *Child Development: A Systematic and Empirical Theory* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961).
22. Among others, the introduction to practice with effective influence techniques might be relevant. See I. E. Siegel, M. Hoffman, A. Deyer, and I. Torgoff, "Toward a Theory of Influence Techniques," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly,* Vol. 12 (Fall 1954), pp. 4-17.

Teaching Casework Skills in the Laboratory: Methods and Techniques

by
NAZNEEN S. MAYADAS and DONALD E. O'BRIEN

In recent years social work has seen a growing trend toward the use of simulations, or laboratory training techniques, as a means of preparing its students for contact with clients. This concept of a laboratory approach is a departure from the traditional social casework presentation of conceptual material followed by or concurrent with the actual practice of casework with live clients in a fieldwork setting. Although efficient as far as it goes, the traditional model neglects the crucial step of teaching the student to operationalize abstract concepts learned in the classroom before sending him into the live practice situation.[1] This paper addresses the concept of laboratory training as a means of bridging the gap between theory and practice, and describes some techniques utilized by the authors to operationalize the laboratory model.

Social casework, from its inception, has placed primary stress on the professional relationship between the caseworker and the client as the crucial variable in the helping process.[2] As far back as 1956, Biestek, in his review of the literature on the casework relationship, referred to it as the "medium through which the know-

Nazneen S. Mayadas is a professor at the Graduate School of Social Work, University of Texas at Arlington and Donald E. O'Brien is an instructor in the Behavioral Science Division, Academy of Health Sciences, Fort Sam Houston, Texas. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position of the Department of the Army or the Department of Defense.

ledge of human nature of the individual is used" and contended that knowledge without skill in relationship is inadequate.[3] However, he found no attempt to operationally define what skills enter into the concept of relationship. To this date it remains vague and abstract, and interviewing skills are still discussed in highly conceptual and intellectual terms in social work literature.[4]

While social work remains enmeshed in its traditional pattern of teaching practice skills via didactic methods and case records, other professions have moved forward and pioneered in the use of the laboratory method to study the therapeutic relationship in behaviorally specific terms.[5] Still, the development of the laboratory method in these related professions has had its impact on social work. In the last few years the literature has reflected a gradual movement away from the traditional classroom-field training method toward a more objective laboratory method. These training laboratories act as a bridge between the practice theories taught in the classroom and their application in the field.[6] The general theme that runs through the current literature on this subject suggests that field placement settings, as a rule, do not provide the student with the context necessary for him to be able to translate his theoretical knowledge into adequate working skills in practice.

The laboratory experience has presented itself as one solution to this problem. Since laboratory training in social work primarily has been arranged and incorporated as part of the academic course content, it falls within the jurisdiction of the schools rather than the agencies. Hence, teaching plans can be made independently of agency policy without the risk of running counter to the demands of client accountability. Also, the laboratory method uses simulations rather than real life situations so that the student can try out his skills and interpersonal behaviors in a relatively safe and structured situation, as well as receive the feedback and guidance of peers and instructors. Simulations provide extensive flexibility in the choice of practice situations, intervention models, client role-behaviors, and practitioner behaviors. Theoretically, the choices available to the student through role playing and simulation of practice situations are unlimited and he has the potential to vary or control any behavioral dimension that he wishes to study for hypothesized outcomes. The benefits of this are further enhanced if audio and videotapes are used in training.

Training techniques discussed in this paper in conjunction with the laboratory method can be traced to the work of Rogers, who empirically investigated the therapeutic interview. His findings suggested that therapist qualities such as congruence, warmth, genuineness, and unconditional positive regard for the patient are associated with positive outcomes.[7] Since then the range of studies investigating the therapeutic process tends to support the contention that the specific or technique factors may not be as potent an influence in therapy as the nonspecific or worker personality variables.[8]

These findings support the empirical investigations of Truax and Carkhuff, who suggested that there were three essential conditions, namely, accurate empathy, nonpossessive warmth, and genuineness, associated with positive client outcomes.[9] Carkhuff further identified a number of other dimensions of good interpersonal functioning that he operationally measured on five-point scales for rating levels of therapist performance. Based on the findings of his investigations, these qualities – empathy, respect, concreteness, genuineness, confrontation, self-disclosure, and immediacy – were incorporated into structured training programs for counselors in the helping professions.[10] However, his taxonomy of desirable interpersonal dimensions, despite his attempts at operationalization, remains somewhat nebulous and abstract. Also, the rating scales are hard to disengage from the subjective reactions of the raters. Perhaps some of these difficulties stem from the abstract nature of these therapeutic qualities, which are hard to define in minute, observable behavioral terms. Also, the works of Carkhuff and Truax were based on audiotape recordings that preclude the study of nonverbal behaviors.

Some of these difficulties in operationalizing such abstract concepts have seemingly been overcome by the work of Ivey et. al.[11] These studies, which are direct outgrowths of the Truax-Carkhuff theoretical position, attempted to identify specific interview behaviors that were significantly correlated with facilitative and action-oriented conditions essential to interpersonal relations. From these empirical investigations Ivey developed a training program, "microcounseling," which has the significant advantage of specifying quantifiable behavioral tasks to be accomplished by the student within an interview. Microcounseling uses modeling tapes and video feedback in teaching interpersonal skills within a controlled interviewing session where specified behaviors are isolated and taught one at a time. As the student masters a given behavior, he moves to the next step at a progressive level of behavioral complexity. Models of desirable behaviors are used and the student receives continuous feedback on his performance both from the instructor and from watching himself on videotape. The four basic behavioral categories taught in microcounseling are (1) attending behaviors, (2) skills of reflecting content and feelings, (3) skills of self-expression, and (4) interpretation. The microcounseling laboratory provides the student with a didactic-experiential training model, and acts as a data source for empirically investigating verbal, nonverbal, facilitative, and nonfacilitative behavior in therapy.

Another method of training therapists was developed by Kagan et al.[12] This is the IPR Method (Interpersonal Process Recall), which is based on the study of the capability of videotapes to stimulate in clients a detailed recall of a given experience. Kagan found that the clients demonstrated a proclivity to analyze the situation brought to recall, both in terms of the affect evoked in them and the rationale for their behavior. Thus considerable material that would otherwise have been lost was brought under the scrutiny of both the client and the therapist. This phenomenon seems to occur because the average individual cannot interact and introspect concurrently. However, if he views the interaction on videotape playback he tends to recall material associated with his perceptions and actions.

This apparent potency of videotape viewing led to the formal development of the IPR training method in which a supervisor trained in the recall techniques guided the replay of the student's interview with the client. The student in these playback sessions can acquire tremendous insights into his interpersonal skills and the rationale for his therapeutic interventions. There are many variations of this basic technique. Recall strategies can be used with the client as well as with the worker. Client recall sessions can be taped and played back to the student therapist to give him a better understanding of the impact his feelings and behaviors have on determining positive or negative outcomes in the therapeutic session. Thus for social casework, where so much emphasis is placed on the supervisor-supervisee process, this method seems invaluable. One of the goals of supervision in casework is primarily to enhance the skills of the worker in his interactions with the client. With the availability of the minimally distorted videotaped feedback of worker-client interaction, both supervisor and supervisee are in a far better position to achieve this goal.

APPLICATION OF THE LABORATORY TRAINING MODEL

Over the past few years the authors have been engaged in developing training programs that attempted to amalgamate the basic concepts of casework, the laboratory method, and the training techniques of Ivey and Kagan.[13] These efforts, which included training paraprofessionals as well as graduate students, began on a broadly conceived base derived from traditional social work training models.

Continuing efforts in this area have led to the adoption of a training schema that is eclectic in nature and adaptable to a wide variety of settings. This schema is conceptualized as a three-step model. The first stage is the didactic-conceptual stage, in which the student obtains a theoretical or abstract knowledge of what is involved in casework. The second stage is a skill-learning phase, in which the student seeks to master the operationalization of the concepts he has learned in the classroom. The third stage combines the gains made in the two earlier stages into the application of skills and knowledge in a supervised fieldwork setting.

The second step of this model, the skill-learning stage, is where the laboratory teaching method is utilized. This method is broken down into a number of phases. In the first phase the student is presented with cognitive information outlining the skills he is expected to master in the training program. He is given written descriptions of specific skills, which are further emphasized by verbal explanations from the instructor. In more sophisticated training operations the written and verbal presentations are supplemented with videotapes of experts modeling the types of behaviors the student is to learn. The initial laboratory experience is planned to help the student make the difficult transition from knowing what should be done to knowing what *he* should do in the actual casework situation before he enters the "real world."

Although any number of skill levels can be differentiated for students, it is convenient for the purpose of this discussion to distinguish just two, a beginning level and an advanced level. Beginning students may be described as those having little or no theoretical knowledge or practical experience. The average student being trained in the Army's paraprofessional social work program would fit into this category. Advanced students are those with a fairly firm conceptual grasp of what is involved in contacts with clients, but who have not had prior direct feedback on their own behaviors in the interviewing situation. The average student in a graduate school of social work probably typifies this level.

In the early training process, both groups of students are presented with cognitive material geared to meet their specific needs. The behaviors they are expected to exhibit are spelled out. This includes delineating the specifics of their performance during the interview as well as indicating what procedures will be followed in the critique session following each interview.

The next step in the laboratory process is to create a simulated casework experience in which the student interviews a "coached" client. Whenever possible the interview is videotaped for replay during the critique session at which the student receives feedback on his performance. This process of instruction, critique, and feedback differs, depending upon the level of students under training, and should be a carefully planned exercise in order to maximize the benefits of the training program.

For example, when using laboratory training with beginning students the writers use a modified microcounseling technique as the basic training scheme. As noted earlier, microcounseling techniques utilize specific, concrete behaviors that are taught in a hierarchical order. The student practices and masters each progressive behavior before moving on to one of higher complexity. The critiques conducted with this level of student are geared toward helping him recognize when he is exhibiting the desired behavior. Also important in these critiques is helping the student recognize the kind of image he presents to the client. Finally, the critique helps the student learn to recognize certain key elements of the interview, such as significant client statements that he may have overlooked.

When working with advanced students it is recommended that the training begin with a modified form of the IPR technique. As indicated earlier, this technique involves making the student more aware of the effects that his thoughts and feelings have on his behavior and subsequently on the outcome of his interaction with the client. It seems to the writers that the successful application of this technique requires the trainers to possess an even higher level of clinical skill than is required in the microcounseling method, since the IPR establishes a nonthreatening situation in which the student can feel free to explore his thoughts and feelings and link them with his interviewing behavior. Many times the trainer is required to make inferences of an almost clinical nature about subtleties of the student's behavior in order to help him look at possible causes of nonfacilitative or nontherapeutic actions during the interview. The aim of the instructor is not to undertake therapy or an in-depth analysis of the student's personality, but to make him aware of the complex ties between his thoughts and feelings, and his overt behavior. Thus the instructor's ultimate goal is for the student to assume the role of self-critic during each training session, with the instructor assuming a more passive role as the student gains competence.

Regardless of the student level and the techniques employed, there are a number of common features inherent in the laboratory method. First, a controlled, nonthreatening, simulated atmosphere is constructed. Second, direct feedback is given to the student immediately after each exercise. Feedback may also come from fellow students who have observed the interview, or from the person who role-plays the client. Also, if videotape is employed, the student receives direct feedback from video self-confrontation. Finally, this method has the valuable feature of allowing the student to process the feedback he receives, take account of areas where improvement is needed, and then conduct another interview session in which he can attempt to improve his performance.

It is often necessary to modify aspects of the training techniques employed in order to fit the requirements of the actual training situation. A number of factors tend to govern the type of laboratory training program finally established. For example, one main influence is the nature of the educational program in the institution where the training is being conducted. If the trainer has free rein in planning he will probably formulate a different type of program than if he has to tailor it to complement existing courses and schedules. Secondly, the number of students to be trained and the amount of training time available will materially affect the type of program developed. Closely associated with this factor is the number of training personnel available and their background and training. A small instructor-student ratio (1:4) will allow a different program to develop than will a larger ratio. Finally, the availability of video equipment will determine the kinds and amount of feedback to which the student will be exposed, and will affect the type of training program to be developed.

Both the IPR and microcounseling methods have the merit of being adaptable and useful when their basic premises are adhered to, even if the execution of the methods is varied. For example, the total microcounseling program spelled out by Ivey can be abbreviated so that only a part of the hierarchy of behaviors is taught. This method is currently being employed at the Academy of Health Sciences to train paraprofessionals. Although Kagan uses a sophisticated video setup to conduct his IPR training program, the authors have found that this method can still be employed with good effect when using a simple one-camera setup, which is within the budgetary and technical reach of most institutions and agencies.

Other modifications that have been tried are combining the microcounseling and IPR techniques to train students when the institutional structure placed severe time limitations on the length of the training program. Also, when faced with a classroom-format type of instruction and a large instructor-student ratio, a group training approach using these techniques has been successful.

Based on the authors' experience, the ideal laboratory training program should be of sufficient length to give each student a solid foundation in interpersonal skills using the microcounseling model. Having acquired a firm base in interpersonal behaviors, he would then progress to the IPR technique to sharpen his therapeutic awareness and effectiveness. Finally, the student would be exposed to a number of different simulated problem situations (e.g., individual problems, interviewing marital couples, etc.) so that when he entered the fieldwork setting he would be prepared to make maximal use of that experience and would be of greater therapeutic use to his clients.

OUTCOMES

The authors have been involved in using the laboratory method since 1970. Their experience in various adaptations of this method stems from teaching in graduate schools of social work, training paraprofessionals, and conducting in-service training seminars for agency personnel. The results of introducing the laboratory method to professional and undergraduate social work education have been most encouraging. Gains have been observed in three general areas: (1) student performance, (2) faculty attitudes toward a new teaching technique, and (3) agency attitudes toward a new method of recordkeeping and supervision.

The pattern that students have shown over time suggests that participation in laboratory training actively increases as the initial discomfort with self-exposure on videotape recedes and the eagerness to practice new and challenging behaviors takes precedence. There is a marked increase in the students' ability to critique themselves. As the training advances their ability to identify and behaviorally demonstrate operational components of interactions progresses. The extent of change is determined by the process of consensual validation between the student, his peers, and the instructor.

Currently in the graduate training program, class tapes of individual students are rated by the group on the performance of concrete behaviors in simulated interviews. The scales used for rating are a modified version of the Carkhuff Level of Functioning Scales.[14] A serendipitous outcome of the laboratory method has been the interest of the students in research and the growing enthusiasm to statistically analyze the data on their own performance. This has been keenly welcomed by instructors and a number of practica are currently underway investigating factors related to the influence of interpersonal variables on behavior.

Another result reinforcing the use of the laboratory method is the demonstrated high performance level of students in the field. Both students and their field instructors concur that students exposed to microtraining laboratories are able to discern critical material much sooner than their peers. This has a dual gratification for the student. It results in satisfactory outcomes for clients, and creates reassurance in the student of his role as counselor. Students have stated that training in microcounseling has not only improved their professional interpersonal competence but has positively affected communication in personal and social relationships. The results of the laboratory method discussed here are consistent with the findings of Ivey et al., where students' performance markedly improved in interviews as a function of skilled training via microcounseling laboratories.

Other tangible results related to the laboratory method in relation to faculty and agency attitudes are: (1) student dissemination of laboratory learning in the community resulting in some agencies purchasing videotape equipment for use in treatment and supervision, (2) introduction of laboratory sessions for field faculty to familiarize them with this training method, and (3) a growing tendency by the classroom faculty to make greater use of tapes instead of case records to illustrate practice skills. The trend toward team teaching has also become more popular. Since the laboratory training method uses modeling of desirable behaviors as one of its basic concepts, the interpersonal exchange among the faculty team becomes of considerable importance. This places the burden on the faculty to practice what they teach.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The laboratory method has become increasingly popular in training professionals in interpersonal skills. Although the original studies and training schemes in this area were developed in professions other than social work, the profession recently has taken heed of these innovations and some graduate schools of social work have introduced interpersonal skills laboratories as a bridge between the traditional classroom and field education model. This paper addresses itself to the authors' experience in training laboratories where knowledge from the classroom is applied to simulations of practice situations in preparation for field practice. As a consequence students are in a better position to synthesize theories of human behaviors and interventive models with practice, and to deal with their clients from a well-integrated knowledge base.

The advantages inherent in this teaching approach for social work education and practice are obvious and consistent with the profession's goals for education, that is, producing practitioners who can intervene in situations with a systematically tested knowledge base that has a certain degree of predictability. Such practitioners would recognize the growing need for an empirical base for practice, and would be willing to open their practice for study and research. At present social work is using borrowed knowledge, but as more interest and concern is generated in the profession about its own commitments and accountability, hopefully it will seek objective measures to determine its effectiveness rather than continue to adhere to untested methods of service delivery.

NOTES

1. A. Gartner and F. Riessman, "New Training for New Services," *Social Work*, Vol. 17, No. 6 (1972), pp. 56-63.
2. F. Hollis, *Casework: A Psychosocial Theory* (New York: Random House, 1964), pp. 160-62; H. H. Perlman, *Social Casework: A Problem-Solving Process* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 64-83; and M. E. Richmond, *Social Diagnosis* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1917), pp. 104, 127-28.
3. F. P. Biestek, *The Casework Relationship* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1957), pp. 3-19.
4. S. Briar, "Effective Social Work Intervention in Direct Practice: Implications for Education" (Paper presented at the 19th Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, San Francisco, California, February 1973); J. Fischer, "Is Casework Effective: A Review", *Social Work*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (1973) pp. 6-7; and W. C. Richan and A. R. Mendelson, *Social Work: The Unloved Profession* (New York: Franklin Watts, 1973), pp. 20-39.
5. R. R. Carkhuff, *Helping and Human Relations: A Primer for Lay and Professional Helpers*, Vol. I and II (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969); A. E. Ivey, *Microcounseling: Innovations in Interviewing Training* (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1971); N. Kagan et al., "Interpersonal Process Recall." *Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases*, Vol. 148, No. 4 (1969), pp. 365-74; and C. B. Truax and R. R. Carkhuff, *Toward Effective Counseling and Psychotherapy: Training and Practice* (Chicago: Adline, 1967), pp. 23-143.
6. M. Forman et al., "Learning and Teaching in a Community Field Laboratory," *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (1971), pp. 32-37; Gartner and Riessman, *op. cit.*; N. S. Mayadas and D. E. O'Brien, "Videotapes Aid in Social Work Education," *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (1973), p. 6; G. Oxley, "The Methods Lab – An Experiment in Experiential Classroom Teaching," *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (1973), pp. 60-63; M. Page and M. Pratt, "Community Laboratory: An Innovation in Higher Education," *Journal of Education for Social Work*, Vol. 9, No. 3 (1973), pp. 45-50; and R. Wells and D. Miller, "Developing Relationship Skills in Social Work Students," *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (1973), pp. 68-73.
7. C. R. Rogers, "The Necessary and Sufficient Conditions of Therapeutic Personality Change," *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, Vol. 21 (1959), pp. 95-103.
8. B. G. Berenson and R. R. Carkhuff, *Sources of Gain in Counseling and Psychotherapy* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967); A. E. Bergin and S. L. Garfield, *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1971); A. P. Goldstein, *Psychotherapeutic Attraction* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1971); H. H. Strupp and A. E. Bergin, "Some Empirical and Conceptual Bases for Coordinating Research in Psychotherapy," *Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 7 (1969), pp. 18-90; and H. H. Strupp, *Psychotherapy: Clinical Research and Theoretical Issues* (New York: Jason Aronson, 1973).
9. Truax and Carkhuff, *op. cit.*
10. Carkhuff, *op. cit.*
11. A. E. Ivey et al., "Microcounseling and Attending Behavior: An Approach to Prepracticum Counselor Training," *Counseling Psychologist: Monograph*

Supplement, Vol. 15, Nos. 2 and 5 (1968), pp. 1-12; and Ivey, *Microcounseling, op. cit.*

12. Kagan et al., *op. cit.*
13. D. L. Garber and D. E. O'Brien, "The Operationalization of Theory in the Training of Paraprofessionals" (Paper presented at the 20th Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, Atlanta, March 1974); D. Katz, N. S. Mayadas, and D. E. O'Brien, "Starting Out in Television: A Student Centered Approach to Media Development in Social Work," *Journal of Education for Social Work*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Winter 1975), pp. 83-88; Mayadas and O'Brien, *op. cit.*; and D. E. O'Brien and N. S. Mayadas, "Training Seminarians at a Family Counseling Agency," *The Catholic Charities Review*, Vol. 56, No. 8 (1972), pp. 14-17.
14. Carkhuff, *op. cit.*, Vol. II.

Technology and Social Casework: A Review of the Literature

by
DONALD E. O'BRIEN and NAZNEEN S. MAYADAS

One of the continuing aims of social work education is to improve the methodology and techniques that are used to prepare students for entrance into the profession. Traditionally social workers have been trained by two distinct methodologies: theoretical models of practice presented in the classroom setting, and the application of these models in a supervised field work setting. The application of theory to actual practice situations remains one of the key elements of social work education. Because of this, the fieldwork experience is considered one of the most important parts, if not the most important, of the student's education.[1]

The significance of this area would seem to indicate that training methods and techniques would be constantly scrutinized with the aim of updating and improving them in order to produce students trained to the highest degree of competence possible. Disturbingly enough, this does not seem to be the case, and the methods used in training students 30 years ago still seem to be generally employed.[2]

Although some new approaches to field instruction have been reported, social work still follows the traditional pattern of the dyadic field instructor-student relationship. Under this plan the student interviews the client, dictates a record of the interview, and at

The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position of the Department of the Army or the Department of Defense.

weekly intervals discusses this record with his field instructor in order to develop his skills and evaluate his efforts. The student's progress usually is explored through the written process or summary record.[3]

This reliance on process recording as the main fieldwork method of training students is an enigma, since as early as 1925 Wannamaker reported the advantages of having verbatim transcripts of interviews with clients to use in improving casework practice.[4] The first electrical recordings of psychotherapeutic interviews were made in 1934 by Zind.[5] In 1942 Rogers published the first complete account of a series of interviews between counselor and client.[6]

With the availability of technical aids for training students in the helping professions and the constant improvement of these devices, steps were taken to improve the training programs in a number of professions (e.g., psychiatry, counseling, nursing). Unfortunately, most of these advances have been in professions other than social work, which seems to be lagging behind in the use of innovative programs to improve the training level of students.

PURPOSE OF THE PAPER

The purpose of this paper is to examine the literature of the profession to determine if and how social work has adjusted its educational program to incorporate the advances of modern technology in training students as practitioners, especially with regard to modern recording devices such as audio and videotape recorders, closed circuit television, and so on. Further, the paper reviews the literature to see if trends exist in the profession that account for the current usage or nonusage of these devices.

In the past 20 years technological developments have made it possible for supervisors to gain direct knowledge of what transpires between student and client, without necessarily disrupting the "sacred" one-to-one relationship. This has been made possible through the availability of such devices as the one-way mirror, and audio and videotape recorders. These have allowed supervisors to overcome the general drawbacks of the process recording and general discussion methods. Over 20 years ago Kogan criticized the process recording method for "possible subjectivity, selectivity of materials, and distortion due to the interpretation and memory lapses of the worker."[7]

This criticism has been voiced by others more recently. Despite the obvious deficiencies, articles still appear regularly in the literature extolling the benefits inherent in training students through this method, which would seem to imply that the adherence to process recording is as strong as ever.[8] As recently as 1968, Leader stated that despite its deficiences, "in social work education the 'case record' is the bible on which most educational dialogues rest."[9] And social work educators are regularly reminded that the Council on Social Work Education has available case records that are continually being updated for use in classroom instruction.[10]

Against this background of tradition both in classroom and fieldwork instruction methods, it is interesting to note the impact that technical aids have made as reflected by the professional literature of the past two decades. Technical aids such as audio recorders, one-way mirrors, and videotape recorders are available in an inexpensive and simplified form that makes them extremely well-suited for the task of recording and reproducing the complex therapist-client interaction. The videotape recorder (VTR) appears to overcome inherent disadvantages in the use of audiotapes, one-way mirrors (audio recorders alone cannot convey the total sense of the client-worker interaction, and the one-way mirror poses scheduling problems and places excessive demands on the supervisor's time), and the more traditional process recording method in student training programs.

THE LITERATURE TO 1966

In pursuance of the literature related to training techniques utilizing advantages offered through these devices, the authors located an annotated bibliography on audiovisual material published by the Council on Social Work Education.[11] Only 18 out of the 110 cited in this publication originated in the social work literature. They were broken into three parts. The first part, "Teaching Uses," lists only 11 articles written from 1950 to 1966. The earliest of these are by Blackey and Kogan.[12] Blackey's article was generally concerned with how audiotape recordings and films could be used for educating social workers. Her thesis was that more dynamic teaching techniques (using technical innovations) can stimulate and accelerate the learning process and economize on teaching and learning time. Kogan, writing at the same time, saw verbatim recordings as an aid in improving techniques and as useful in the training of social workers. Oswald lists no other article in this category until ten years later when Itzin wrote on the advantages of using audiotape recording in a fieldwork setting.[13] From this, one gets the impression that the discovery that tape recordings could be helpful in improving student training was perhaps a novel idea for social work.

Oswald cites other articles in this section. Kelly elaborated on the uses made of audiotapes at Simmons College in both classroom and fieldwork settings.[14] Articles by Marriage and Pepper,[15] and Beatman[16] are listed in this section, but their discussion of technical aids seemed only coincidental. It was not until 1966 that Oswald was able to find any real interest in this area, namely, two articles by Perlmutter[17] and two published by the Council on Social Work Education.[18] Collectively these articles dealt with the use of videotapes in the training of social workers. Further review of the literature added only three references to this section. There was a letter to the editor published in *Social Casework* in which Hildebrand responded positively to Itzin's article, and reported using audiotapes for staff training to improve therapeutic skills of agency staff members,[19] and a reference by Poheck to new techniques available for training students in which she called upon schools of social work to "experiment with newer approaches [to teaching], for example, . . . closed circuit television."[20] Two years later Fanshel advocated the use of tape recorders as a necessary training device if social work hoped to meet the goals it espoused in the training of student workers.[21] Although this article was an advanced one for social work, it was already behind the times from the standpoint of other professions that were using videotapes and other training devices as a standard part of their programs.[22]

In the second section of the bibliography, "Research Uses," Oswald lists only four publications. Again Kogan was an early leader in this area and reported using verbatim recordings of interviews to test hypotheses about processes in casework interviews.[23] Oswald then cites an article by Thomas et al. as the next instance of a reported research project using tape recordings as the source of data.[24] Two other articles by Kadushin and Wilkie reported similar usages of tape recordings and completed the references in this section.[25]

The authors' search of the literature uncovered three other references in this area. In 1962 Shyne advocated the use of electrical recordings to collect data about client behavior instead of relying primarily on the recollection of the worker and three years later reported using tape recordings of interviews during an experimental project for the purpose of analyzing the methods and techniques of caseworkers.[26] In 1966 Smith reported using audiotape recordings to collect objective data for a research study of interviewing phenomena.[27]

In the third and last section, "Conceptual and Technical Aspects of Production and Use," Oswald lists only three articles. The earliest was by Kadushin and was primarily a theoretical discussion of whether or not interviews should be observed, and how this issue related to casework and educational theory.[28] An article by Weissman was largely irrelevant to this topic since it was mainly a report of a social worker who appeared on an educational television program.[29] The last article described the experiences of the University of California, Berkeley School of Social Welfare in trying to develop a training program using videotapes.[30] However, this article was generally anecdotal, nonspecific, and not very informative to anyone actively groping with a similar problem of formulating a training program using video techniques.

Other than the above-mentioned articles the only other references that appeared in the social work literature until 1966 were a number of notes in the *Social Work Educational Reporter* which informed the readers that audiotapes of recorded interviews were available for use in classroom teaching situations; a reference to the use of videotapes in teaching that appeared in the August 1964 issue; and one short article by Norwood that reported the results of a survey of the nation's schools of social work to determine the extent of the use of videotape material in their training programs.[31] It is interesting to note that this survey found that only 11 schools in the country were actively using videotape equipment. The overall impression was that very few schools were taking advantage of this teaching technique, but that the Council on Social Work Education hoped the situation would improve in the future.

CHANGE IN THE LITERATURE AFTER 1966

In 1966, the year that Oswald's bibliography appeared, social work finally seemed to recognize that technology could help improve its training methods. From this point on there was a change in the literature regarding the utilization of audiovisual devices in educational programs.

For example, in 1967 Benschoter et al. showed how the imaginative use of videotapes, closed circuit television, and personal supervision could revitalize and add new dimensions to efforts for providing adequate supervision and a realistic training situation for students in groupwork.[32] During the same year Perlmutter and Gumpert published an article in which they described using videotape in the training of groupwork students.[33] Rather than emphasizing technique, as was done by Benschoter et al., Perlmutter and Gumpert discussed the theoretical aspects of videotape playback and self-observation on student behavior. This paper was the first in the profession to examine this aspect of television and its effect on the student. At the same time, Perlmutter et al. published an article in the *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* describing the use of videotapes in family diagnoses and therapy. They discussed the technique used and its value, and offered a theoretical explanation of the process that made it effective.[34] These two papers by Perlmutter et al. possibly were the high-water mark of social work's sophistication in utilizing audiovisual techniques.

During 1967 three items of note appeared in the *Social Work*

Education Reporter.[35] In March a news note indicated that six new teaching media had been demonstrated at a Council on Social Work Education meeting. These included telephone teaching, loop films, television teaching tapes for use in classroom settings, portable video tape recording devices, overhead projectors, and audiotapes. In June the *Reporter* noted that videotapes concerning the disadvantaged child were available on loan from the University of Minnesota, and in December it noted that the Department of Social Services in New York State was initiating an orientation program for new welfare employees that included eight videotapes centered around the human factors and social services.

In 1968 the trend continued. Kotis reported using audiotapes to collect data for a study he was doing on group counseling with alcoholics.[36] Sherman considered the value of participant observation in the training of students and cited the value of using both video and audio recordings to augment student learning.[37] Vinson wrote on a program conducted in Australia where students were videotaped in role-playing situations. These tapes were then played back to the students in a classroom situation and served as the basis for the instructor's teaching program and for the student's self-evaluation.[38]

An article by Leader called attention to the value of using videotapes not just to train students, but to improve the performance of experienced staff members. He advocated using the "observed" interview to improve the ability of consultants and supervisors to aid workers in helping their clients. He noted that this technique was a considerable improvement over the old case record method of supervision.[39] Mullen produced two articles in which he reported using tape recorders to collect data for a study he was doing concerning treatment procedures by experienced caseworkers.[40] Finally, Lewis and Liberman described how videotape helped in diagnosing and treating a problem child's behavior and progress as necessary for interdisciplinary cooperation and decision making. This article was anecdotal, however, rather than theoretical or technically oriented.[41]

More recently there have been indications of a spreading awareness of the value of audiovisual aids in the areas of training and treatment. Three articles described the use of videotape at the agency level.[42] Also, an article by Wells and Miller reported using audiotapes to train students in counseling techniques at the University of Pittsburgh.[43] Oxley reported continued use of videotape at the University of California, Berkeley School of Social Welfare to teach methodology to students.[44] Finally, Mayadas and O'Brien reported programs developed to train students in a wide variety of videotape usages and interpersonal skills.[45] Further, Oswald and Wilson published a unique book titled *This Bag is Not A Toy* that provides an excellent introduction for professionals interested in using video techniques as a training tool.[46]

We have seen that the use of videotapes and audio recordings increasingly have been brought to the attention of the profession. However it does not seem that these efforts have met with overwhelming success. Just a few examples will suffice to show how some segments of the profession have reacted to the prospect of change.

REACTIONS OF THE PROFESSION TO CHANGE

Blanck,[47] in a letter to the editor, rejected Fanshel's[48] premise that recording devices will not interfere with client responses in the treatment situation but he did not offer any evidence to support his statements. Schubert reported a research study that purported to measure fieldwork performance of students. She used process records dictated by students as a means of measuring their actual behavior with the clients.[49] The results of this study must be questioned because of the serious possibilities of error inherent in this type of data collection. Although the study took place 15 years ago, it is representative of the type of research that was to follow at regular intervals in the social work literature. For example, Ehrenkranz and Hollis both published studies that relied on written case records as sources of data.[50]

Another instance of the seeming lack of sophistication by the social work profession in adapting to modern methods can be found in a publication in 1963 by HEW consisting of two volumes concerned with the training of welfare workers. These volumes outlined an approach to training staff members in broad areas of social welfare practice and listed different materials that were available as supplemental aids to the training program described in the volumes. Although films, slides, and a few prerecorded tapes were mentioned, it is interesting to note that videotapes were completely ignored.[51]

A further instance of this lack of acceptance of the benefits of modern technology can be found in an article by Appelberg that described the use of written records to teach casework to social work students.[52] Finally, an example of the profession's current attitude is seen in CSWE's *Catalogue of Publications* for 1973-74. This pamphlet lists six pages of canned records that are available for use in schools of social work.[53]

Confronted with these examples of resistance to the value of direct recording and observation techniques, despite evidence to the contrary,[54] we are faced with the question of why this situation exists. Some of the articles written in social work over the years help us gain some insight into the possible causes of this situation. For example, Blackey said that traditionally social workers have shied away from methods of helping clients that would expose the client and the worker. However, she did not say why this condition persists.[55] Ryan and Bardill noted that "there has been a general reluctance in social work education to depart from [using process recordings]" and to adopt any new training techniques. "Even new training devices such as recorders and one-way mirrors have been less accepted in social work than in the other helping professions. Undoubtedly some of this reluctance is derived from traditional social work attitudes towards confidentiality and the rights of clients." The authors noted that other professions such as law and medicine have not been hindered by this reluctance and they urged social workers to make more use of these devices.[56]

Fanshel also wrote on this subject. He said that "there is a considerable fear in many areas of [social work] practice [and research]" that acts against the use of recording devices, and added that a change is beginning to take place in social work's attitude in this area. However, he deplored that fact that in this modern age "a student can go through his entire graduate training without being exposed to a reproduction of his own or another professional person's interviewing procedures." He then refuted the argument that recording interviews may harm the client, and observed that these recordings "appear to present a much more serious problem for some professional people than it does for the clients."[57]

Although the recent literature indicates some changes within the profession concerning the use of recording devices, the situation has not changed to the extent desired.[58] An illustration of this unwillingness to share practice knowledge and skills with the profession is shown in an article by Paget in which he noted staff resistance to having practice objectively recorded for scrutiny.[59]

CONCLUSION

From the review of the literature it can be inferred that this situation developed because of traditional resistance to change, fear of exposure of client and worker, and the lack of ability to clearly delineate worker behaviors in systematic terms. These factors led social workers to label their activities as a unique and creative art that could not be reduced to its specific component parts in order to be openly researched and evaluated.

However, this attitude may change as the result of an important trend that might significantly affect the future of academic social work. Until very recently social workers were trained mainly as practitioners, and the profession had not geared its educational programs to produce sophisticated researchers. Today, with the increasing emphasis on doctoral programs in social work, more trained researchers are becoming available to study the various facets of the profession. Thus it would seem that in the future a more research-oriented group of workers will come into prominence who will show a greater inclination to open up social work practice and training for detailed examination.

It is ironic, however, that a profession which consistently has emphasized worker-client interaction as the focus of study should shun the very technical aids that make available the systematic study of these behavioral units. It is hoped that the increasing awareness of objective recording devices for collecting data will gradually cause social work to expose its practice to empirical investigation and to reply more heavily on systematic research to support its knowledge base. Thus, paradoxically enough, it appears that the emerging emphasis on research will of necessity be the vehicle for continued improvement in the quality of social work education and practice.

NOTES

1. H. Stein, *Curriculum Study* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), pp. 54-58.
2. W. Holden, "Process Recording," *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (1972), pp. 67-69.
3. F. Ryan and D. Bardill, "Joint Interviewing by Field Instructor and Student," *Social Casework*, Vol. 45 (1964), pp. 471-74.
4. C. Wannamaker, "Social Treatment from the Standpoint of the Client," *The Family*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (1925).
5. L. Kogan et al., "The Electrical Recording of Social Casework Interviews," *Social Casework*, Vol. 31 (1950), pp. 371-78.
6. C. Rogers, *Counseling and Psychotherapy* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1942).
7. Kogan, *op. cit.*
8. V. Bellsmith, "New Frontiers in the Teaching of Social Casework," in *Ego Oriented Casework: Problems and Perspectives*, eds. H. Parad and R. Miller (New York: Family Service Association of America, 1963), p. 272; C. Hildebrand, Letter to the Editor, *Social Casework*, Vol. 41, No. 6 (1960), pp. 314-15; F. Itzin, "The Use of Tape Recording in Field Work," *Social Casework*, Vol. 41, No. 4 (1960), pp. 197-202; Ryan and Bardhill, *op. cit.*; S. Sherman, "Teaching Casework Through Participant Observation," *Social Casework*, Vol. 49 (1968), pp. 595-601; A. Shyne, "Casework Research: Past and Present," *Social Casework*, Vol. 43, No. 9 (1962), pp. 467-73; C. Wilke, "A Study of Distortions in Recording Interviews," *Social Work*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (1963), pp. 31-36; M. Dwyer and M. Urbanowski, "Student Process Recording: A Plea for Structure," *Social Casework*, Vol. 46, No. 5 (1965), pp. 283-86; and Holden, *op. cit.*
9. A. Leader, "Supervision and Consultation Through Observed Interviewing," *Social Casework*, Vol. 49, No. 5 (1968), pp. 288-93.

10. M. Poheck, "Case Records for Teaching: Time for a Critical Reappraisal," *Social Work Education Reporter,* Vol. 11, No. 6 (1963), pp. 12-13.
11. I. Oswald, *An Annotated Bibliography on Audiovisual Instruction in Professional Education* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1966).
12. E. Blackey, "The Use of Audio Visual Aids in Training," *Social Casework,* Vol. 31 (1950), pp. 366-71; and Kogan, *op. cit.*
13. Itzin, *op. cit.*
14. E. Minnie Kelley, "Additional Uses of Tape Recordings in Social Work Education, *Social Casework,* Vol. 43, No. 1 (1962), pp. 26-29.
15. A. Marriage and G. Pepper, "An Experiment in Stimulating the Student's Professional Imagination," *Social Casework,* Vol. 43 (1962), pp. 59-64.
16. F. L. Beatmen, "The Training and Preparation of Workers for Family Group Treatment," *Social Casework,* Vol. 45 (1964), pp. 202-208.
17. M. Perlmutter, "Videotapes for Graduate Instruction," in *New Horizons in Social Work Education and Training Through Videotapes and Loop Films* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1966), chapter I; and M. Perlmutter et al., "An Analysis of an Instructional Television Approach to the Teaching of Social Work Methods," *Social Work Education Reporter,* Vol. 14, No. 1 (1966), pp. 19-21.
18. E. Schaub, "Loopfilms for Training Intake Interviewers," in *New Horizons, op. cit.,* chapter III; and M. Tarail, "New Techniques of Professional Social Work Education," in *New Horizons, op. cit.,* chapter II.
19. Hildebrand, *op. cit.*
20. M. Poheck, "Toward a Methodology of Teaching," *Education for Social Work, 1964, Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Program Meeting* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1964).
21. D. Fanshel, "Sources of Strain in Practice-Oriented Research," *Social Casework,* Vol. 47, No. 6 (1964), pp. 357-62.
22. L. Gottschalk and A. Auerbach, *Methods of Research in Psychotherapy* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966).
23. L. Kogan et al., "Validation of Caseworker Impressions by Verbatim Recording," *Social Casework,* Vol. 32 (1951), pp. 376-81.
24. E. Thomas et al., "The Experimental Interview: A Technique for Studying Casework Performance," *Social Work,* Vol. 5 (1960), pp. 52-58.
25. A. Kadushin, "Testing Diagnostic Competence: A Problem for Social Work Research," *Social Casework,* Vol. 44 (1963), pp. 397-405; and Wilke, *op. cit.*
26. Shyne, *op. cit.,* and "An Experimental Study of Casework Methods," *Social Casework,* Vol. 46, No. 9 (1965), pp. 535-41.
27. N. Smith, "Practitioners' Orientations to Knowledge and Conceptual Learning from Practice: Part II," *Social Casework,* Vol. 47, No. 9 (1966), pp. 590-96.
28. A. Kadushin, "Interview Observation as a Teaching Device," *Social Casework,* Vol. 38 (1956), pp. 334-41.
29. H. Weissman, "The Social Worker in Educational Television," *Social Work,* Vol. 8 (1963), pp. 96-100.
30. I. Oswald, "Through the Looking Glass: Adventure in Television," *Journal of Education for Social Work,* Vol. 1, No. 1 (1965), pp. 47-55.
31. *Social Work Education Reporter,* Vol. 10, No. 3 (1962), p. 15; Vol. 11, No. 1 (1963), p. 25; Vol. 11, No. 2 (1963), p. 24; Vol. 11, No. 6 (1963), pp. 12-13;

Vol. 12, No. 4 (1964), p. 8; Vol. 13, No. 1 (1965), p. 18; and F. Norwood, "Instructional Television Survey," *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 14 (1966), pp. 22, 62.

32. R. Benschoter et al., "The Use of Closed Circuit TV and Videotape in the Training of Social Group Workers," *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (1967), pp. 18-19.
33. M. Perlmutter and G. Gumpert, "Field Instruction and Group Process: An Experiment in the Use of Television," *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (1967), pp. 26-29.
34. M. Perlmutter et al., "Family Diagnoses and Therapy Using Videotape Playback," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, Vol. 37 (1967), pp. 900-905.
35. *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (1967), p. 6; Vol. 15, No. 2 (1967), p. 32; and Vol. 15, No. 4 (1967), pp. 20-21.
36. J. Kotis, "Initial Sessions of Group Counseling with Alcoholics and Their Spouses," *Social Casework*, Vol. 49, No. 4 (1968), pp. 228-32.
37. Sherman, *op. cit.*
38. A. Vinson, "Television and Group-Centered Learning," *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (1968), pp. 32-33.
39. Leader, *op. cit.*
40. E. Mullen, "Casework Communication," *Social Casework*, Vol. 49, No. 9 (1968), pp. 546-52, and "The Relation Between Diagnosis and Treatment in Casework," *Social Casework*, Vol. 54, No. 4 (1969), pp. 218-23.
41. J. Lewis and H. Liberman, "Use of Videotape to Diagnose and Treat an Exceptional Child," *Social Casework*, Vol. 51, No. 7 (1970), pp. 417-20.
42. D. E. O'Brien and N. S. Mayadas, "Training Seminarians in a Family Counseling Agency," *The Catholic Charities Review*, Vol. 61, No. 8 (1972), pp. 14-17; N. W. Paget, "Use of Videotape Equipment in a Child Welfare Agency," *Child Welfare*, Vol. 48, No. 5 (1969), pp. 296-300; and Sheldon Silk, "The Use of Videotape in Brief Joint Marital Therapy," *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, Vol. 26, No. 3 (1972), pp. 417-24.
43. R. A. Wells and D. Miller, "Developing Relationship Skills in Social Work Students, "*Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (1973), pp. 68-73.
44. G. B. Oxley, "The Method Lab: An Experiment in Experimental Classroom Teaching," *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (1973), pp. 60-63.
45. N. S. Mayadas and D. E. O'Brien, "A Report: Videotapes Aid in Social Work Education," *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (1973), p. 6; Mayadas and O'Brien, "Teaching Casework Skills in the Laboratory: Method and Technique" (Paper presented at the 20th Annual Program of the Council on Social Work Education, Atlanta, Georgia, March 10-13, 1974); and D. Katz, N. S. Mayadas, and D. E. O'Brien, "Starting Out in in Television: A Student Centered Approach to Media," *Journal of Education for Social Work*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (1975), pp. 83-88.
46. I. Oswald and S. Wilson, *This Bag is Not a Toy: A Handbook for the Use of Video Recording in Education for the Professions* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1971).
47. R. Blanck, Letter to the Editor, *Social Casework*, Vol. 48, No. 7 (1966).
48. Fanshel, *op. cit.*

49. Margaret Schubert, "Field Work Performance: Repetition of a Study of First-Year Casework Performance," *Social Service Review*, Vol. 34, No. 3 (1960), pp. 286-93.
50. S. Ehrenkranz, "A Study of Joint Interviewing in the Treatment of Marital Problems: Part I," *Social Casework*, Vol. 48, No. 8 (1967), pp. 498-501; and Florence Hollis, "A Profile of Early Interviews in Marital Counseling," *Social Casework*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (1968), pp. 35-43.
51. *Learning and Teaching in Public Welfare*, Vol. I and II, Report of the cooperative project on public welfare staff training (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1963).
52. E. Appleberg, "Teaching Casework from Student's Own Material," *Child Welfare*, Vol. 50 (1971), pp. 593-98.
53. *Catalogue of Publications, 1973-74* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1973).
54. N. Kagan, et al., "Interpersonal Process Recall," *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, Vol. 148, No. 4 (1969), pp. 365-74; Allen E. Ivey, *Microcounseling: Innovation in Interviewing Training* (Springfield, Ill: Charles C. Thomas, 1971); and James J. Onder, *The Manual of Psychiatric Television: Theory, Practice, and Imagination* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Maynard House, 1970).
55. E. Blackey, *op. cit.*
56. Ryan and Bardill, *op. cit.*
57. Fanshel, *op. cit.*
58. R. Wells, "The Use of Joint Field Instructor-Student Participation as a Teaching Method in Casework Treatment," *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (1971), pp. 58-62.
59. N. W. Paget, *op. cit.*

The Place of Operant Procedures in the Social Work Curriculum

by
ARTHUR SCHWARTZ

There is much conflict and confusion in the current teaching of social casework and social treatment methods. Some workers in the field have even gone so far as to call the turmoil a crisis although my older colleagues at the University of Chicago reassure me that the field of casework has always been in a crisis and that the extent of the crisis depends upon your perspective. I see the current scene as one of turmoil, confusion, and honest grappling with problems that are pregnant with the promise of change and reform.

There are many conflicting philosophies in social work today. Rogers has imaginatively stated that there are three main trends in treatment thinking today: the psychoanalytic or psychodynamic in the mainstream; the third force, humanistic, Rogerian, or existential on one wing; and the objectivist or behaviorist on the other.[1] However, another observer has counted not three but over 85 such systems, and the count is continually going up.[2]

In addition, the field of social work is currently rent by a seemingly profound but actually needless argument as to whether the main thrust of its efforts should be helping the individual or changing the system itself. The Third Social Work Symposium was needlessly concerned with social work's failure to direct efforts to change

Arthur Schwartz is an associate professor at the University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration.

the system as well as to help individuals and families who are victims of that system and who are shortchanged by it. What is needed is a social work strategy or a group of strategies based on theories broad enough to help the individual and also effect system change. This dilemma in social work will continue as long as we do not risk ourselves in the exploration of new intervention strategies. The fighting within the field obscures the reality that no current model can be expected to be comprehensive enough to fit the multitudinous target of social work intervention, especially in view of the rapid political and societal changes and the explosion of information and technology.

The purpose of this paper is to propose the consideration of an orientation to social dysfunctioning (and functioning) that is broad enough to include not only the individual but the family, the larger social groups, and the social system itself. I call this approach *applied behavior analysis*. It stems from the experimental analysis of behavior and subsumes behavior modification. It is also called operant conditioning, Skinnerianism, behaviorism, and I'm sure quite a few other things too. Techniques based on operant principles have been applied with a great deal of success in many kinds of situations, ranging from work with individual clients, families, delinquent gangs, and neighborhoods to the rehabilitation of entire cultural groups overwhelmed by technological and cultural changes.

Although operant methods work they have posed some still-to-be solved problems. Contrary to some of its most vehement supporters (who may turn out in the end to be its worst enemies) the millenia is not yet here, although the promise is indeed great.

The behaviorist assault on the social work curriculum has been stormy and has aroused a great many feelings and counterattacks. Much of this argument unfortunately, is based more on ideology and vested interest than on an appreciation of the assumptions, techniques, goals, and methods involved.

Critics have assailed the operant approach as "not validated, mechanistic, atomistic, manipulative and unethical, inconsistent with 'the' casework approach, limited in applicability, and not really new." These criticisms were abstracted from an article by Morrow and Gochros, who stated that each "criticism [bears] a grain of truth but involves misconception."[3] This extreme defensiveness, premature closure, and rejection of new methods based on operant technology has obscured the great potential of the operant approach for training effective social work practitioners.

Personalities and vested interests aside, why all the furor? Perhaps the greatest irony is that there is much in the operant approach that is not only similar to what is actually practiced in the field setting, as opposed to what is usually taught in the classroom, but also is compatible with current models. Indeed, Morrow and Gochros state that "there may be a grain of truth" to the claim that social workers "have been doing this for years, [that] social workers have probably been applying behavioral learning principles and behavior modification procedures without realizing it. Perhaps they could be more effective if they applied learning principles more systematically and consistently and drew upon a wider variety of behavior modification techniques."[4]

Part of the confusion and the extreme emotionalism that characterizes negative reactions to behaviorism is that most dynamic teachers and practitioners either are not aware of or do not appreciate the split that characterizes contemporary behaviorism. At the risk of oversimplifying, there are essentially two diverse, although overlapping, behaviorist orientations. The first is the better-known, more traditional stimulus-response conditioning model. This orientation is often called classical, involuntary, or respondent conditioning and postulates the familiar stimulus-response model of behavior.

We are all familiar with poor Pavlov's dogs salivating over a bell when they really expected meat. With the exception of a few specific conditions, applications of this type of conditioning have not proven very effective in ameliorating man's problems. This stimulus-response orientation is the majority view in Europe and undergirds the writings of the most prolific American Pavlovian therapist, Joseph Wolpe, and his reciprocal inhibition therapies, particularly systematic desensitization and assertive counterconditioning. Among other respondent therapies are the implosive therapy of Stampfl, various aversive treatments such as conditioned reflex treatment for alcoholism and homosexuality, and the early conditioned reflex approaches of Andrew Salter. The Pavlovian, stimulus-response model does have some applicability in certain cases, such as in the work of Masters and Johnson, but behaviors that were previously thought to be reflexive and involuntary have recently been shown to come under the control of environmental factors. This is shown in the work of Neal Miller and his associates in the conditioning of heart rates and autonomic responses.

The prevailing view in American behaviorism today is not the stimulus-response psychology of Pavlov, but an operant conditioning orientation based on the work of Skinner and his disciples, as exemplified in the *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*.[5] This view stands in seeming juxtaposition to Pavlovian conditioning.

Skinnerian, or instrumental conditioning postulates that behavior has an effect or operates on its environment and is sustained or extinguished according to this effect, hence the term operant conditioning. Behaviors that continue are those that are reinforced because they have some consequence for the individual. Freud stated, and Skinnerians agree, that behavior is lawful, meaningful, purposeful, and not accidental. Behavior, no matter how strange or maladaptive it may seem, has some consequence for the individual and persists because there is a "payoff" for the individual; the observation that it persists means that it is positively reinforced and needs to be examined. Perhaps the individual has no alternative means for obtaining the pay-off.

Behavior does not occur in a vacuum. There are events or conditions that precede behavior (antecedent stimulus events) and events and conditions that follow behavior and provide consequences (consequential stimulus events). There are other factors that accompany, precede, or follow behavior, including feelings (emotional concomitants) related to an event. Each of these relationships – of events to behavior, of behavior to behavior, and of the individual to the behavior and the events – is called a contingency. Individuals, families, and groups live within an ecology of contingency relationships that are complex, rich, and in constant interaction. The behaviorist states that behavior is determined by the interrelationship of the individual with these contingencies as modified by factors such as biological inheritance, past history of conditioning, and internal factors.

The applied analysis of behavior necessitates an examination of the events that precede, accompany, and follow behavior as well as an examination of the individuals involved. Viewing man in the totality of his contingency relations is a principle that has long been taught in social work schools as viewing the individual in the situation. Man is not a robot responding involuntarily to stimulus commands, nor is he the diminished man so rightfully feared by Perlman and so prophetic of the potential horrors of a 1984. Man is an active human being operating on his environment, manipulating his contingencies, and continually developing his competence. This view is a pro-freedom view, for it states that the more man increases his competence, the greater are his capabilities for action. The greater the capabilities for action, the greater his options, and the greater his options, the greater his freedom. This increased potential for action is, in the operant sense, the real meaning of freedom and the real humanism; it is a design for action rather than empty and prescriptionless platitudes.[6] In recognition of this, the American Humanist Society gave its Man of the Year award for 1972 to Skinner.

Much of the operant approach has elements in common with the more traditional approaches. Translations are possible and, in my opinion, are desirable between the two approaches for the construction of some future model, some future lingua franca. For example, assessment of the individual's strengths and current problem situation parallel processes now described by the term diagnosis, which has been inappropriately borrowed from medicine. The old study-diagnosis-treatment triad parallels the operant study-assessment-programming.

Operant work stresses specificity of outcome expectations. The specification is stated in terms of goals, a term common to all social work endeavors. The specificity parallels the partialization or limited goals that characterize the problem-solving approach of Perlman and, more recently, the time-limited approaches of Reid and Shyne. It is a cousin to the "tasks" of the task-centered approach of Reid and Epstein.[7]

INTERVENTION: A THREE-PRONGED APPROACH

Intervention in the operant orientation is usually a three-pronged approach. The client and the worker engage in a joint determination of what the terminal goals, the desired end-state of intervention, will be. This end-state of affairs is called the *terminal repertoire* in operant terminology. The client answers questions such as: What would a successful outcome be like? What would you like to be? What specific behaviors, under what specific conditions, with what consequences will characterize the terminal repertoire?

The second step in the operant approach is to assess the client's strengths, the situations in the past and present that he has handled successfully, his current and past problematic situations and experiences, but always in the context of his present strengths. These present strengths and competencies we call the current relevant repertoire.

The third phase is to formulate a plan for intervention that will bring the individual with his current relevant repertoire to his terminal repertoire. The client determines his terminal repertoire, the client and worker jointly assess his current relevant repertoire, and jointly plan his program of intervention. This joint planning is analogous to the therapeutic alliance so often held as an ideal in our current teachings on social work interventions on the individual, group, and larger levels. The client's autonomy is not only respected, it is heightened, for he joins the social worker as joint or coplanner of his program. In practice as well as in theory, the aim of the program is to turn over the programming to the client as soon as possible, thus affirming the social work principle of self determination, both in goal setting and in program planning to a degree that is generally greater than those approaches where goals are not specific and procedures are not manifest.[8]

The second prong, the assessment of strengths, is a reaffirmation of the person in the situation and an individualization of the client with his unique biological endowment, his unique history of conditioning, and his current circumstances.

After the third step, the determination of a program, the client and worker sign a contract, which is concrete evidence of the working alliance or therapeutic alliance. This contract states not only the outcome goals but the procedures by which the outcome goals will be attained. It can be changed by joint agreement but never unilaterally by the caseworker. Thus both client and worker expectations are manifest and open for all to see. The procedures are open to ongoing evaluation. In fact, the building-in of ongoing evaluation of this method is one of the most promising and exciting potentials for tangible contributions to an empircally oriented social work practice. The procedures may be changed whenever there are indications that progress is less than anticipated. The burden for change is borne by the program and the worker, given minimal cooperation by the client.

The question of motivation is secondary to the efficacy of the program. If the program fails, which sometimes happens in all modes of intervention, then the worker does not indulge in rationalizations based on client shortcomings such as lack of motivation, but examines the program to see where the procedures were deficient in potentiating the program as a reinforcer for the client. This approach has the advantage of encouraging program change and innovation although it is less comfortable than blaming the client for what often turns out to be deficits in our intervention or gaps in our knowledge.

MISCONCEPTIONS OF OPERANT PROCEDURES

As can be seen by the above procedures, the openness of the contractual agreement puts more control into the hands of the client. The issue is often raised that operant workers treat people like puppets, that they are manipulative and concentrate on control of clients. The spector of a *Clockwork Orange* is essentially an artificial issue raised against a kind of behaviorism that is not the predominant mode of practice.

I want to emphasize that operant practitioners generally disavow the use of aversive techniques based on punishment, negative reinforcement, and the like, not only on moral grounds but because punishment merely suppresses maladaptive behavior and produces unpleasant emotional consequences such as escape, avoidance, and counteragression. The failure of the American penal system is evidence of the failure of punishment techniques.[10] Positive reinforcement of competing behavior that is incompatible with maladaptive behavior is more effective and does not produce negative side effects.

Operant work itself is constantly expanding and changing, building upon explicit reports of clinical and laboratory work. Early behaviorist writers in social work did stress Pavlovian techniques and the seemingly mechanical and rigid application of operant techniques applied in cookbook fashion. However, new approaches and orientations have characterized the evolution to what is really a discipline of the analysis of behavior. Current operant workers do utilize techniques, but within a context of teaching the client the rationale of the approach and teaching him to be his own behavior analyst, thus equipping him with carryover procedures. The goal of the process is to teach insight into the behavior-contingency (man in his situation) relations. By insight we agree with Marmor who says that "what we call insight is essentially the conceptual framework by means of which a therapist establishes, or attempts to establish, a logical relationship between events, feelings, or experiences that seem unrelated in the mind of the patient."[11]

There are other misconceptions. The process of intervention operates on more than just the conscious level, as witness the use of the word insight. Moreover, how often is insight used in casework and contemporary psychotherapy in its old sense of viewing-in to the unconscious? The operant practitioner does accept the existence of the unconscious although he usually will not use that word. The existence of something inside the skin is acknowledged, although it is not the skin that is the boundary but lack of access to the external reinforcing community.[12] Of course there is an unconscious: all of us dream, make slips of the tongue, and have *déjà vue* experiences. However, we really don't know much about the unconscious, so that the radical behaviorist refuses to construct elaborate, unproven, and untestable hypotheses about the nature of this unconscious and merely states, as did Freud and Piaget as well as Skinner, that more complete knowledge must await advances in science, whether in brain chemistry, physiology, or cognitive psychology.[13]

The specificity of the procedures have given rise to charges that operant practitioners downplay feelings and ignore relationship and relationship factors. Nothing could be further from the truth! In operant social work, relationship is a necessary but not sufficient condition for change. In addition, programs and the applications of specific procedures based on empirically derived knowledge are needed. Insensitive people cannot be effective operant social workers.

Feelings are definitely grist for the operant therapeutic mill. Feelings are discussed, analyzed, worked on. They are considered an indication that things are not right with the individual within the context of his ecology. Feelings must be subjected to a functional analysis to be productive of intervention strategies. Psychoanalysis found out long ago that mere abreaction by itself held little promise for lasting therapeutic change. The task becomes one of functional analysis, a specification of what is wrong. The statement "I am feeling anxious" tells us little; the statement "something is making me anxious" enables the client and worker to zero in, pinpoint, and intervene. Feelings are accurate indicators of change in individual-contingency relationships; even individuals with free-floating anxiety are anxious under some conditions and not anxious under others. Moreover, the operant view is that changes in behavior generally precede changes in feeling and not the reverse. The weight of evidence seems to support the operant viewpoint.[14]

I could continue to cite parallelisms between the two approaches but it would be foolish to deny that there are also great differences. For example, the operant view has mistakenly been called atheoretical – a set of procedures in search of a theory. The operant worker does not eschew theory as many have misunderstood Skinner to say, but prefers that theory be inferred from empirical observations. This is unlike the hypothetical-deductive models of most dynamic theorists who start with a large body of theory and test, either clinically or statistically, the tenability of operationalized concepts.[15]

INTRODUCING OPERANT PRINCIPLES TO SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS

Rather than continue to list similarities and differences that have been discussed elsewhere and are continually being debated,[16] it might be more productive to discuss how we introduce operant principles to social work students who generally do not have a background or the interest in experimental psychology, but who want a thorough grounding in the principles in order to use them with their clients. Contrary to their initial expectations, social work students do not shun principles derived from work with infrahuman species if these principles are presented as applicable to humans. The work of Robert White on competence, for example, is based to a large degree on animal observations, as is the work of Harlow on maternal behavior, of Seligman on depression, and others.

At the University of Chicago we have utilized a number of ways to introduce students to the literature, theory, and practice of operant conditioning. There are, of course, a small number of students who have a great amount of undergraduate work in operant psychology, which often includes extensive work with animals and in the experimental psychology laboratory. The task with this group of students is twofold: first, to expose them to the more traditional psychoanalytically and dynamically oriented methods through growth and development courses, and secondly, through fieldwork placement in a more traditional, dynamically oriented setting. This last is a must to prevent premature theoretical closure in the opposite direction.

Some of our students have elected courses in experimental and applied behavior analysis given in the psychology department. These courses feature readings in both the animal and human literature, and give a good background for work in social agencies, especially when they are combined with class and field placement in more traditional approaches. However, the majority of our students receive their first exposure through courses in the school of social work. We have found it best to initially use textbooks that present the principles derived from animal work but are concerned mostly with humans. Unfortunately, there is at this time no completely satisfactory textbook written for beginning social workers. We have used Reese's slim but good book that combines animal and human work, with Sulzer and Mayer's book written for teachers.[17]

We have also experimented with a new approach that seems to have a great payoff. This is a series of self-modification exercises, in which the student takes one of his own behaviors, isolates the condition controlling the behavior (antecedent, consequential, and so forth), takes baseline measures, plans a method of intervention, implements the intervention, and charts and analyzes his progress. Students have chosen such behaviors as overeating, insufficient study behavior, speech mannerisms, relations with children, dating behavior, and so on.[18] The self-modification exercise has several advantages: it makes theory and practice close and personal, it does not involve another person and it is personal and meaningful. The exercises are also semiprogrammed so the exercise serves as a model of intervention. These exercises are handed in weekly and returned with copious comments and suggestions with three days. Students are reinforced quickly for their efforts. The preliminary results seem quite gratifying. We supplement these readings and exercises with large lecture groups that make extensive use of clinical material from the Behavior Analysis Laboratory at the university. Large lectures are supplemented by small discussion groups in which we discuss the exercises and go into greater depth on the theoretical principles.

The chief difficulty for students seems to be that the operant framework is a new way of looking at human behavior and downplays extensive theoretical speculation. This new orientation involves learning a new language that uses familiar words in a new context. For example, positive and negative reinforcement, positive and negative punishment, schedules, extinction, and consequences are all technical terms that describe specific procedures, but these words already have meanings in the students' minds. In operant language, positive and negative do not mean good or bad but refer to the addition or the taking away of a stimulus. Reinforcement refers to the effect of a procedure on a rate of behavior and is not synonymous with reward and punishment in the conventional sense. Students, as well as all beginning workers in this area, have particular difficulty differentiating negative reinforcement from punishment, and so on. However, these misunderstandings are cleared up quickly. The directness and forthrightness of the approach sometimes startles students. The lack of theoretical superstructure and the emphasis on the empirical often is taken for lack of substance, superficiality, and lack of depth, which is not at all the case.

APPLICATIONS TO THE CURRICULUM

We have had individual students in field placements at the laboratory. Students have been placed in mental hospitals and facilities for mentally retarded children. Others are helping devise programs for training parents to deal with problematic and deviant behaviors in the home, and some are working on programs to train parents to be their own counselors. Students also have access to programs in other parts of the university that deal with a number of phenomenon such as therapy for drug addicts (students are applying operant techniques at methadone maintenance clinics), work with animals, conditioning of autonomic process, and so on. These opportunities are being expanded into the community, since we have an ever-increasing number of requests and lack only the trained personnel to fulfill them. The applications are almost limitless.

Plans are now before the faculty to develop an operant unit in "real life" natural settings where group contingencies can be applied, such as in geriatric wards, schools for disturbed children, hospitals, and so forth.

The important caveat is that operant techniques should be presented as an evolving body of knowledge, constantly growing but still incomplete and, repeating what I stated above, certainly not as the utltimate answer to social work's cornucopia of problems.

SUMMARY

In summary, operant or behaviorally oriented social work has much proven potential and promise for the development of future intervention models. While many contributions of applied behavioral analysis are new and innovative, there are many points of agreement as well as disagreement with more traditional models. We as social work educators can choose these points of disagreement as occasions for future battles, which will prove fruitless, or we can seize them as the entering points for a dialogue that could point the way to merging, and developing a future practice model that could combine the best elements of all the current approaches, as well as those that are yet to be developed. Indeed, unless the profession devotes considerable effort to developing this new model, its currently threatened position will be further eroded by other occupations, and social work preparation for practice will become increasingly irrelevant.

Let us begin the dialogue!

NOTES

1. Carl R. Rogers, "Toward a Science of the Person," in *Behaviorism and Phenomenology: Contrasting Bases for Modern Psychology*, ed. T. W. Wann (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 109.
2. H. E. Smith, personal communication. Cited by Arnold A. Lazarus, "Critical Evaluation of the Converging Paths of Behavior Therapy and Psychotherapy: Significant Differences and Insignificant Similarities," *International Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 8 (July 1969), p. 512.
3. William R. Morrow and Harvey L. Gochros, "Misconceptions Regarding Behavior Modification," *Social Service Review*, Vol. 44 (September 1970), pp. 293-307.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 305.
5. *The Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis,* Todd R. Risley, ed., published by the Society for the Experimental Analysis of Behavior. Information from the Department of Human Development, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, 66044.
6. B. F. Skinner, "Humanistic Behaviorism," *The Humanist*, Vol. 31 (May-June 1971), p. 35.
7. See Helen Harris Perlman, *Social Casework: A Problem-Solving Process* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), and her most recent statement, "The Problem-Solving Model in Social Casework," in *Theories of Social Casework*, ed. Robert W. Roberts and Robert H. Nee (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), pp. 129-80. See also William J. Reid and Ann Shyne, *Brief and Extended Casework* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969); and William J. Reid and Laura Epstein, *Task-Centered Casework* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972).
8. Helen Harris Perlman, "Self-Determination: Reality or Illusion," *Social Service Review*, Vol. 39 (1965), pp. 410-21.
9. Israel Goldiamond, "Applications of Operant Conditioning," in *Current Trends in Army Medical Psychology*, ed. Charles A. Thomas (Denver: Fitzsimmons General Hospital, 1969), pp. 198-231.
10. Ellen J. Ryan Rest, "Making Criminal Justice and Social Justice Compatible: A Task for Behavior Analysis" (Paper delivered at the Third NASW National Professional Symposium, New Orleans, November 28, 1972).
11. Judd Marmor, "Psychoanalytic Therapy As an Educational Process: Common Denominators in the Therapeutic Approaches of Different Psychoanalytic 'Schools'," in *Science and Psychoanalysis*, Vol. 5, ed. Jules Masserman (New York: Grune and Stratton, 1962), pp. 286-99.

12. Richard I. Evans, *B. F. Skinner: The Man and His Ideas* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1968), pp. 7-10.
13. Arthur Schwartz, "Beyond Freud and Skinner: Behavior Analysis and Social Work Practice in the 1970s" (Paper delivered at the Third NASW National Professional Symposium, New Orleans, November 28, 1972).
14. Leon Festinger, "Behavioral Support for Opinion Change," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 28 (1964), pp. 404-17.
15. This view is also taking hold in other disciplines. See Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory* (Chicago: Aldine, 1967).
16. See Max Bruck, "Behavior Modification Theory and Practice: A Critical Review," *Social Work*, Vol. 13 (April 1968), pp. 43-55; and the reply by Robert D. Carter and Richard B. Stuart, "Behavior Modification Theory and Practice: A Reply," *Social Work*, Vol. 15 (January 1970), pp. 37-50. See also Morrow and Gochros, *op. cit.*
17. Ellen P. Reese, *The Analysis of Human Operant Behavior* (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, 1966); and Beth Sulzer and G. Roy Mayer, *Behavior Modification Procedures for School Personnel* (Hinsdale, Ill.: The Dryden Press, 1972). An excellent introductory text, although on a more sophisticated level and including much animal work, is the following: Charles B. Ferster and Mary C. Perrott, *Behavior Principles* (New York: New Century, 1968). A programmed text, slightly dated but still useful is the now classic by James G. Holland and B. F. Skinner, *The Analysis of Behavior* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961).
18. The exercises are taken from David L. Watson and Roland G. Tharp, *Self-Directed Behavior: Self-Modification for Personal Adjustment* (Monterey, Calif.: Brooks-Cole, 1972).

The Client As a Collaborator in Social Work Teaching

by
BURT SHACHTER

Teachers of social work practice methods have increasingly recognized the need to blend creatively the theoretical, deductive forms of learning with experiential, inductive educational processes. This blending, whether occurring in class or field, has been reflected in recent years in a plethora of resourceful new instructional structures: the methods lab,[1] sensitivity training applied to group methods learning,[2] the instructor as a participant-consultant in observed interviewing,[3] observed interviewing behind the one-way screen,[4] and various adaptations of student-instructor cotherapy.[5]

These unfolding educational ventures tend toward an inductive emphasis that involve simulating or reenacting practice situations or participating with students in actual practice experience. The conceptualization flows from what has been witnessed, perceived, or felt. Theoretical abstractions have immediate reference points in what has been observed. Certainly the existential mood of contemporary students is tapped. There is in this trend the suggestion of a corrective response to the traditional, compartmentalized separation of class and field, of the theoretical and experiential in social work education. In this regard one might take note of Somer's stress on identifying the most effective mode by which the student learns in the continuum of deductive-inductive approaches.[6] Nevertheless, necessary learning modes that do not evoke popular student acclaim should not be ignored.

Burt Shachter is a professor at the New York University School of Social Work.

The writer's impressions, derived from class evaluation discussions and formal reactionnaire forms, reinforce the perceptions of a growing number of social work educators that students are meaningfully touched by shared student-instructor experience. Certainly canned written cases depicting the work of others evoke less response in students and are best used sparingly and selectively. Particularly noteworthy is that students have a strong recurring interest in seeing the instructor reveal his own practice. While the student bares his own foibles and competencies in supervised field practice and learns from close instructor scrutiny of his work, he also has a thirst for seeing how the teacher, expert, or accomplished professional practices.

Leader discusses exposure of instructor practice in referring to his participation as a consultant in family interview situations: "One advantage of the observed interview is that it permits the consultant to bring out key issues and feelings through demonstration, through emotional involvement while verbal and nonverbal reactions are taking place rather than through filtered memories and intellectual discussions.'[7] Papell notes that utilizing the T-Group in simulation of group practice illustrates the powerful influence of the worker on a group. She states:

> Since all were looking at the trainer through the eyes of a group member, the impact of intervening differentially in a group process took on new significance. There seemed little doubt to the participants that the experiential learning sharpened many concepts that have been taught theoretically.[8]

Ryan and Bardill stress that a fuller view of both the verbal and nonverbal dimensions of the interview is offered in joint instructor-student practice than is possible in the traditional focus on selectively recorded material.[9]

While this paper alludes to some of the educational values of instructor revelation of himself in practice situations, it is not intended as a detailed critique of these newer instructional forms. Rather, the major intent is to explicate another variation on the theme of conveying practice skill experientially in the classroom, namely, via instructor-client collaboration in recapitulating the critical events of the shared social work treatment experience. More substantial analysis can be gleaned from other writers or left to future endeavors.[10]

MODES OF INSTRUCTOR-CLIENT COLLABORATION IN CLASSROOM EDUCATION

The writer has utilized two modes of instructor-client collaboration in classroom teaching:

1. Instructor and client recapitulate the critical emotional and transactional events as they are retrospectively perceived after the course of a therapeutic process.
2. Significant members of a residential treatment team, namely caseworker, assistant director, and supervisor (in this instance also the class instructor) recapitulate with the client the critical emotional and transactional events as they are retrospectively perceived after the course of a residential treatment process.

Instructor-Client Recapitulation

With reference to the first mode the instructor has especially used one client (Bob) with whom he had been engaged in a treatment experience for over three years. The client at the outset of treatment was a character-disordered, orally aggressive, demanding, highly insecure but intelligent adolescent of 16 years. He was an only child who had come from a chaotic, disturbed family situation. His mother was overtly psychotic and had been in-and-out of mental hospitals. The father was a physically ill, self-involved man whose major psychic energies were invested in his own survival. Family scenes, occurring during interludes between the mother's visits from the state hospital, were marked by violent quarrels, physical attacks, and constant apartment changes in order to evade bill collectors.

The client was unrealistically parentified and was used as a decoy in avoiding the ever-present pursuit of those seeking to recover debts. Admission to the residential treatment club in which the boy was helped began when he ran away to a local police station after a particularly violent knife-wielding assault on him by his father. This led to a series of referrals and placement at a club on a neglect petition.[11] At the time he was doing poorly in school despite his intelligence and was engaged in self-destructive combative relationships with peers, teachers, and other authorities.

The instructor maintained contact with Bob on an informal basis for some years after formal after-care treatment terminated. Bob survived the death of both parents and utilized individual social work treatment stormily but well. He completed high school and college. He rebounded from several traumatic relationships with women and finally made a fairly balanced, comfortable marriage. He is currently a welfare caseworker and student in a school of social work. The treatment path toward autonomous, adaptive growth was long and tortuous, full of strains as well as gratifications.

The writer has often found it useful to consult his clients after a course of treatment on what worked and what didn't and on what the client's real perceptions of the treatment experience were after distance had been gained from the therapeutic situation. Learning from the client in this way can be an additional and singularly effective means of evaluating one's practice.

Bob agreed to share perceptions of our experience with my students. Although I felt that I might be exploiting the client for the educational benefit of others, Bob reassured me that he did not view the invitation as an exploitation. He saw it as a mark of my confidence in his personal growth and a chance to help others by contributing to the education of social workers. It is also relevant to note that Bob had a flair for the dramatic. This has also been true of other clients used in class presentation. Not all clients easily lend themselves to this kind of venture.

In the collaborative process the instructor and client reminisce without a prepared script about the evolvement of the helping process. The client is asked to dwell upon his perceptions of the circumstances that brought him into treatment. The instructor and client discuss their respective recollections of the engagement period, critical events, impediments to treatment progress, and the most significant transactions that contributed to fulfillment of treatment goals. Students are encouraged to question both participants. The students discover that even instructors have clay feet and that they too suffer countertransference problems and have to be aware of personal irrationalities that might detour the helping process from pursuit of professional goals. The students also are intrigued with the nature of initial distrust and resistance and how this is overcome. Realization that occasional missed appointments or protracted periods of testing are frequently part of the therapeutic process with certain kinds of clients lends perspective to what the continuum of the helping effort might entail.

In the instance of the collaborative effort with Bob, students found that transferential aspects of negative, demanding, and belligerent behavior is characteristic of many transactions in daily relationships and might have to be confronted sharply and firmly within the therapeutic relationship. They found it instructive that the therapeutic alliance might even survive the transitory countertransference irritations of the social worker because of strong empathetic understanding of the sources of desperate insecurity underlying surface defensive behavior.

Students often are assigned difficult clients (acting-out, character-disordered people, drug addicts, chronic psychotics) who require long-term treatment without being able to see the helping process through to its full conclusion.[12] In witnessing the instructor-client recapitulation of their experiences they are exposed to the whole continuum of treatment, including a natural ending rather than a nine-month, procrustean-bed termination. Student questions often zero in on how one separates from a client, what kind of goals are relevant, and countertransferential aspects of letting the clients go. This provides another context in which students are helped to see that the ultimate objective of a professional social worker is not to be needed by his client.

Observing the perceptions of the client and instructor-practitioner on such matters as handling dependency-independency transactions, resistance, or goal setting evokes learning involvement of much greater intensity than can be evoked by written records concerning others remote from the classroom situation.

Residential Team-Client Recapitulation

In another version of using the client as a collaborator in teaching, the participation was broadened to include the casework supervisor (in this instance the instructor) and assistant director of the club as well as the caseworker. In this situation the client, Stan, was a 16-year-old who had provoked his removal from a succession of five foster homes in eight years. He was said to be ungovernable and destructive at home and stole from supermarkets, used profane language, and was involved in serious school vandalism. His mother had died of cirrhosis of the liver when Stan was two and one-half years old. His father was a well-meaning but immature and dependent man who couldn't keep his family together despite his desire to do so. A new marriage was fraught with tension and there was constant friction between Stan and his stepmother in the periods between foster home placements. Stan was beyond the control of all who played parental roles prior to his admission to the club.[13]

In this particular client-collaboration mode students have an opportunity to see the interplay between individual social work treatment and therapeutic milieu work in its entirety. The differential way in which staff roles are played out emerges. The subtleties of interdisciplinary staff interaction are visible.

Students found meaning and perspective in the painfully slow, tumultuous process of client-caseworker engagement as revealed by Stan and his caseworker in their perceptions of initial interviews. Early encounters were characterized by obscenities, slammed doors, and fending-off and reaching-out transactions. Stan recalled his unwillingness to entrust his secrets to "someone who looked like a kid." The caseworker conveyed the self-doubt and countertransferential struggles elicited by client provocation. Students in turn easily found reference points in their own insecure experiences as young practitioners with difficult clients. The fact that this trying, stormy effort at engagement could eventually lead to trust and serious therapeutic work was important from the student perspective.

The response of an empathetic but tough and not easily intimidated assistant director to the client's physical assault and numerous testings was elucidated, along with an array of critical milieu events. One could easily discern the interaction of the counselors and the administration as rational authorities, while the caseworker was an enabler who helped the client more realistically perceive and understand his behavior in the environment.

Students were able to stop the action and search for further significance in the recapitulations that transpired. As the presentation continued it became clear that the client could not succeed in provoking the rejection he characteristically experienced and that his behavior could be controlled without the usual experience of adult abandonment. Stan progressed from almost total investment of psychic energy in self-destructive, retaliatory behavior to completing high school with a 90 average and learning new, more adaptive adult work and sex roles. The two steps forward and one step backward nature of the process added to the student view of the treatment transaction.

This collaborative adventure with Stan has now been captured on audiovisual tape. It has been played to classes via television with Stan reacting to himself on tape and responding to further student questioning. As with the first mode presented earlier, this live-client format offers another means of conveying the mystique of the therapeutic process, with the added dimension of the differential contributions of residential treatment team members.

EDUCATIONAL RATIONALE FOR CLIENT-INSTRUCTOR COLLABORATION IN TEACHING

The Impact of Client Feedback

In considering the teaching-learning process Somer observes: "It is the student who learns and the teacher who teaches, but it is possible for the student to learn without being taught; it is possible for the teacher to teach without the student learning; and it is inevitable that, if there is real engagement of the two, the learner will learn from the teacher, but also teach him and the teacher will teach the student but also learn from him."[14] In other words, the teacher transmits but does not know with certainty what has been received. Hopefully the transmission stimulates, challenges, informs, and sets in motion within the student a process of thought and exploration that enhances learning. In order for the teacher to evaluate his teaching he must consult his students. He must learn from them what has worked and what has not worked. He must critically determine the extent to which teaching input and/or student input into the teaching-learning transaction should be modified. A teacher able to master his anxieties and invite student feedback in this way can gain advantage in reworking his content and teaching approach.

Clients are also in a position to teach the practitioner. Such evaluative client feedback is applicable in all social work practice and is not simply a matter for the kind of classroom educational collaboration depicted in this paper. It is a psychological truth that a sense of self emerges as we see our impact reflected through the perceptions of significant others. This also holds true for the ongoing emergence of the professional self. Clients are exceedingly important participants in a shared experience. Retrospective feedback from them enables the practitioner to sort out more effective from less effective ways of promoting problem-solving activity and growth in his clients. He then continues to define and redefine his image of himself as a professional person. In the classroom collaboration described here, students witness one view of the client teaching the practitioner. They appreciate the fact that clients may be quite willing to make their contribution to the practitioner's learning when they are openly and sincerely approached by the practitioner. The students thus have a meaningful exposure to the client-practitioner feedback process as well as to the substance of the therapeutic work itself.

Identification in Student Learning

Students learn their practice skills not only cognitively by means of autonomous conflict-free ego functioning but by means of identification.

> The teacher by the way he conveys his regard for his own clients and his skill in helping them, by his freedom in revealing his countertransference difficulties and his ways of coping with them, by his very presence as a practitioner-teacher, offers himself as a professional object for identification. This kind of learning can be far more effective than simply listening to the teacher's pronouncements on conceptual abstractions having little relation to what the teacher is and what he does.[15]

The Hinsie and Campbell *Psychiatric Dictionary* contains the following definition of identification: "When a person incorporates within himself a mental picture of an object and then thinks, feels and acts as he conceives the object to think, feel and act the process is called identification, but the process is largely an unconscious one."[16] It is important to note that identification is not simple imitation. One must beware of providing prescriptions that are literally aped and that are not reflective of truly internalized comfortable ways of practicing. The process by which we arrive at ego identity, as conceptualized by Erikson, includes a consolidation of identifications with parts of a number of objects. What we become in terms of both professional and personal identity contains elements of our own intrinsic temperament and capacity as well as internalized aspects of other signficant people.[17]

Thus the instructor is one among a number of professional models with whom students can identify. The instructor should convey that his approach is not sacrosanct, that it is not *the* approach but rather one more view of technique that is demystified and made more explicit in the client-instructor collaborative presentation. Of course, the instructor is seen by the student as a person of special significance at a time when the student is most receptive in his intellectual development. This is as it should be as long as the pitfalls of discipleship are understood and avoided.

Student Perspective on the Continuum of the Helping Process

As suggested earlier, students at times experience premature terminations with clients in their field experience. They may be assigned to work with clients whose problems are not as easily circumscribed and dealt with as might be desired in a student program. The nine-month or much shorter periods often suffice for situational problems or crises that are experienced by otherwise intact clients. However, this is not true for clients such as the multiproblem family whose members experience chronic crises, the character-disordered adolescent whose difficulties are not perceived as lying within himself, or the drug-addicted person whose massive anxieties and dependency needs have led to habitual drug-related defensive behavior. Students are often preoccupied with the difficult engagement phase and solidification of the therapeutic alliance when confronted by the trauma of termination dictated by the student's learning requirements. Often clients have been transferred from other social workers or prior students in the first place. Old separation vulnerabilities are aroused and dominate much of the last few months of the student-client activity.

While there is valid learning inherent in handling such termination, the student's view of the therapeutic process may become unnaturally skewed. Along with this the student experiences uneasy feelings associated with a sense of client abandonment, self-doubt, and lack of perspective on what his long-term impact might be. The perspective gained via the client's recapitulation of his treatment experience as described in this paper, is a more hopeful and realistic one. The practitioner comes to appreciate more clearly the effect of work with the client when the termination is a mutually planned one that arises out of goals that are defined and achieved. Both modes of client-practitioner classroom presentation enhance this perspective, which does not usually result from the student's fieldwork.

Hearing directly from the client provides an important countervailing force to the seeds of cynicism and doubt being sown within the profession concerning the efficacy of practice.[18] A student planning to become a professional social worker needs some assurance that the object of his investment is worthwhile. While a healthy self-critical stance toward practice is to be encouraged, students respond well to demonstrations by instructor-practitioners and clients that practice can indeed be effective. It is our task to enable our students. as well as ourselves, to distinguish between the circumstances under which social work practice works and the circumstances under which it does not.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper suggests two modes of enhancing teaching-learning transactions. Use of the client as a collaborator of the instructor in recapitulating the social work treatment experience in the classroom is described in several of its variations. These modes are not meant to replace necessary deductive, theoretical learning, but rather to offer a means of enriching learning and moving more effectively from inductive, live portrayals of treatment experience to the derivative conceptualizations. The impact of learning from the client, the opportunity for identification with the instructor-practitioner, and the emergence of a clearer perspective on the continuum of treatment all flow from the instructor-client collaboration depicted.

The relevance of the instructor's ongoing direct practice experience is underscored in utilizing this instructional mode. We see here reaffirmation of the need for balance between practice-related and research-oriented instructors in achieving the profile of instructional attributes recommended by Soffen for social work faculties.[19]

There are risks involved when the instructor exposes his own practice. He is more vulnerable to the scrutiny of his students. His willingness to be exposed suggests to students that theirs are not the only risk-taking ventures. That the instructor can have clay feet, make mistakes, and learn from his mistakes encourages students to do likewise. Collaboration with clients can also be reflective of our respect for the client's perceptions and achievements. Client, student, and instructor share in the recapitulation of an experience from which there can be growth dividends for all.

NOTES

1. Genevieve B. Oxley, "The Methods Lab – An Experiment in Experiential Classroom Teaching," *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (December-January 1973), pp. 60-63.
2. Catherine Papell, "Sensitivity Training: Relevance for Social Work Education," *Journal of Education for Social Work*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Winter 1972), pp. 42-55.
3. Arthur Leader, "Supervision and Consultation Through Observed Interviewing," *Social Casework*, Vol. 49, No. 5 (May 1968), pp. 288-93.
4. Regina Kohn, "Differential Use of the Observed Interview in Student Training," *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (September-October 1971), pp. 45-46.
5. Richard A. Wells, "The Use of Joint Field Instructor-Student Participation As a Teaching Method in Casework Treatment," *Social Work Education Reporter*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (December-January 1971), pp. 58-62; and Francis J. Ryan and Donald A. Bardill, "Joint Interviewing by Field Instructor and Student," *Social Casework*, Vol. 45, No. 8 (October 1964), pp. 471-74.
6. Mary Louise Somers, "Dimensions and Dynamics of Engaging the Learner," *Journal of Education for Social Work*, Vol. 7, No. 3 (Fall 1971), pp. 49-58.
7. Leader, *op. cit.*, p. 290. Note also that Leader has adopted the same method of participation in observed interviews in an advanced seminar in family treatment conducted at the New York University School of Social Work. Students arrange to bring their families from field practice into the classroom. Leader demonstrates his technique as a consultant for the benefit of the student practitioner concerned as well as for the whole class. While there may be some initial problems in securing student and family volunteers for this purpose, students learn much from this kind of endeavor.
8. Papell, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
9. Ryan and Bardill, *op. cit.*, p. 473.
10. See for example the cautions of Kohn (*op. cit.*, pp. 45-46) regarding the notion of instructor participation in observed interviews. In particular, note her concern about possible instructor-student competitive aspects and the effect of the instructor's consultation on the student's role with his clients.
11. The club in question was the Stuyvesant Residence Club (Jewish Board of Guardians), a small community-based residential treatment facility on the lower east side of New York City. It serves an ethnically mixed population of delinquent, disturbed, or drug-oriented male adolescents, 16 to 21 years of age.
12. The time requirements for the therapeutic process is being intensely reviewed in social work and other rehabilitative disciplines. See for example William J. Reid and Laura Epstein, *Task Centered Casework* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972), who promote a short-term, time-limited model as a method of choice. Yet the kinds of clients for whom their model is admittedly inapplicable are frequently the ones served by social workers and social work students.
13. Indebtedness is expressed for the helpful participation of Josiah Young, assistant director (now assistant professor of fieldwork, Rutgers University School of Social Work) and John Steinfirst, caseworker (now director, Midwood Addiction Project, Jewish Board of Guardians).

14. Mary Louise Somers, "Contributions of Learning and Teaching Theories to the Explication of the Role of the Teacher in Social Work Education," *Journal of Education for Social Work*, Vol. 17, No. 3 (Fall 1969), p. 64.
15. Burt Shachter, "Relevance of Direct Practice for Today's Social Work Educator," *Journal of Education for Social Work*, Vol. 17, No. 3 (Fall 1969), p. 43.
16. Leland E. Hinsie and Robert J. Campbell, *Psychiatric Dictionary*, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 373.
17. Erik H. Erikson, "The Problems of Ego Identity," in *Identity and Anxiety*, ed. Maurice R. Stein et al. (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960).
18. See in particular Joel Fischer, "Is Casework Effective? A Review," *Social Work*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (January 1973), pp. 5-21; "Points and View Points," *Social Work*, Vol. 18, No. 5 (May 1973), pp. 104-108; and John Ehrlichman's famous remarks published in a recent issue of the *Wall Street Journal*, sarcastically inviting social workers to go out and get honest jobs.
19. Joseph Soffen, *Faculty Development in Professional Education* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1967), p. 41.

OTHER RECENT COUNCIL PUBLICATIONS

The Adelphi Experiment: Accelerating Social Work Education, by Aaron Rosenblatt, Marianne Welter, and Sophie Wojciechowski. $4.50

The Dynamics of Field Instruction: Learning Through Doing. $3.50

Management Practice in Social Welfare: An Annotated Bibliography, compiled by Rino J. Patti with the assistance of Phillip Osborne. $3.50

Professional Components in Education for Fundraising, edited by Frank M. Loewenberg. $3.50

Social Science and Social Welfare, edited by John M. Romanyshyn. $4.50

Social Service Manpower Needs: An Overview to 1980, by Sheldon Siegel. $2.00

Social Work in Rural Communities: A Book of Readings, edited by Leon H. Ginsberg. $4.00